

RFE File

Approved For Release 2005/04/27 : CIA-RDP75B00380R000400020004-6

Calendar No. 251

93d CONGRESS
1st Session

SENATE

REPORT
No. 93-266

SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORIZATION FOR RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

JUNE 27 (legislative day, JUNE 25), 1973.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. PERCY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1972]

The Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred the bill (S. 1972) to authorize supplemental fiscal year 1973 appropriations for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to authorize additional fiscal year 1973 appropriations for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to provide for increased costs resulting from the devaluation of the dollar on February 12, 1973.

GENERAL BACKGROUND

The amount originally authorized and appropriated for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for fiscal year 1973 was \$38,520,000. Later, to cover the increased costs of operations resulting from the dollar devaluation in February 1973, a supplemental request for \$1,832,000 was made by the Administration.

COMMITTEE ACTION

S. 1972 was introduced by Senator Percy on June 8, 1973. The committee met in executive session to discuss the bill on June 27, and by a vote of 8 to 2 ordered it reported favorably, with an amendment. The committee's amendment, unanimously agreed to, substitutes a specific limit of \$1,150,000 in place of the original bill's open-

ended authorization of "such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary." Those voting to report favorably were Senators Sparkman, Pell, Humphrey, Case, Javits, Scott, Percy, and Griffin. Those opposed were Senators Fulbright and Symington.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 4 of the rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in *italic*, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman) :

United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, as amended

Public Law 402, 80th Congress [H.R. 3342], 62 Stat. 6, approved January 27, 1948; as amended by Public Law 298, 82d Congress [S. 2077], 66 Stat. 43, approved April 5, 1952; Public Law 414, 82d Congress [H.R. 5678], 66 Stat. 276, approved June 27, 1952; Public Law 665, 83d Congress [H.R. 9678], 68 Stat. 862, approved August 26, 1954; Public Law 555, 84th Congress [S. 2562], 70 Stat. 241, approved June 4, 1956; Public Law 726, 84th Congress [H.R. 11356], 70 Stat. 555, approved July 18, 1956; Public Law 85-477, 85th Congress, 72 Stat. 261, approved June 30, 1958; Public Law 87-139, 75 Stat. 339, approved August 14, 1961; Public Law 87-256, 75 Stat. 527, approved September 21, 1961; and Public Law 92-394, 86 Stat. 577, approved August 20, 1972.

AN ACT To promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations.

* * * * *

TITLE VII—APPROPRIATIONS

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION BY CONGRESS

SEC. 701. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no appropriation shall be made to the Secretary of State, or to any Government agency authorized to administer the provisions of this Act, under any law for any fiscal year commencing on or after July 1, 1972, unless previously authorized by legislation enacted by the Congress after the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971. The provisions of this section shall not apply to, or affect in any manner, permanent appropriations, trust funds, and other similar accounts administered by the Secretary or such agency as authorized by law.

TRANSFER OF FUNDS

SEC. 702. The Secretary shall authorize the transfer to other Government agencies for expenditure in the United States and in other countries, in order to carry out the purposes of this Act, any part of

any appropriations available to the Department for carrying out the purposes of this Act, for direct expenditure or as a working fund, and any such expenditures may be made under the specific authority contained in this Act or under the authority governing the activities of the Government agency to which a part of any such appropriation is transferred, provided the activities come within the scope of this Act.

AUTHORIZATION FOR GRANTS TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

SEC. 703. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$38,520,000 for fiscal year 1973 to provide grants, under such terms and conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate, to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. *There are further authorized to be appropriated in fiscal year 1973 not to exceed \$1,150,000 for nondiscretionary costs.* Except for funds appropriated pursuant to this section, no funds appropriated after the date of this Act may be made available to or for the use of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty in fiscal year 1973.

○

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
ON
S. 1914
TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE BOARD FOR
INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING, TO AUTHORIZE THE CON-
TINUATION OF ASSISTANCE TO RADIO FREE EUROPE AND
RADIO LIBERTY, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

JUNE 12 AND 23, 1973



Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 1973

98-661

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

J. W. FULBRIGHT, Arkansas, *Chairman*

JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama

MIKE MANSFIELD, Montana

FRANK CHURCH, Idaho

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island

GALE W. MCGEE, Wyoming

EDMUND S. MUSKIE, Maine

GEORGE S. MCGOVERN, South Dakota

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota

GEORGE D. AIKEN, Vermont

CLIFFORD P. CASE, New Jersey

JACOB K. JAVITS, New York

HUGH SCOTT, Pennsylvania

JAMES E. PEARSON, Kansas

CHARLES H. PERCY, Illinois

ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Michigan

CARL MARCY, *Chief of Staff*

ARTHUR M. KUHL, *Chief Clerk*

(II)

CONTENTS

Statements by:	Page
Ball, Hon. George, former Under Secretary of State.....	117
Bartlett, Paul R., independent communications consultant.....	129
Durkee, William, President, Radio Free Europe.....	36
Eisenhower, Milton, Chairman, Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting; accompanied by Edward W. Barrett, John A. Gronouski, and Edmund A. Gullion.....	63
Glazov, Yuri, Professor at Boston College.....	143
Goldberg, Hon. Arthur, former Ambassador to the United Nations and former Supreme Court Justice.....	80
Halberstam, David, author.....	136
Harriman, W. Averell, former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union.....	109
Karst, Roman, Professor of German Literature, The State University of New York.....	150
Rush, Hon. Kenneth, Acting Secretary of State; accompanied by John A. Baker, Director, Office of Eastern European Affairs, Department of State.....	7
Sargeant, Howland, President of the Radio Liberty Committee.....	24
Spilners, Ilgvars J., President, American Latvian Association in the United States, Inc.....	158
Insertions for the record:	
Text of S. 1914, 93d Cong., 1st sess.....	1
"Détente and the Continuing Need for RFE and RL," excerpt from "The Right To Know," Report of the Presidential Study Com- mission on International Radio Broadcasting.....	8
Letters of Mr. Jan Nowak, Radio Free Europe, Division of Free Europe, Inc., concerning positions of Senators Fulbright and Case on Radio Free Europe.....	17
Department of State statement concerning Mr. Jan Nowak's letters.....	20
Detailed information on licensing and rental arrangements in host countries.....	25
Additional information on liquidation costs of radios.....	27
Coverage of Chancellor Brandt's visit to Israel by Soviet and East European media and by Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe.....	36
Stimulation of East European and Soviet news media by RFE and RL.....	37
Soviet and East European media treatment of U.S. space achievements.....	40
Additional information on Soviet media treatment of Jewish emigration.....	43
Coverage of Brezhnev visit to the United States, June 1973, by Soviet bloc media, Radio Liberty, and Radio Free Europe.....	44
Short-wave radio receivers in the United States, the USSR, and Eastern Europe.....	54
"Soviet Propaganda Selling Improved U.S. Ties To Public," article by Robert G. Kaiser, the Washington Post, April 10, 1973.....	57
"Soviets Get New, Positive View of the United States," article by Robert G. Kaiser, the Washington Post, May 2, 1973.....	58
Memorandum for the record from William P. Durkee, President, Free Europe, Inc., concerning letters of Mr. Jan Nowak.....	61
Prepared statement of Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower.....	64
Statement by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower on Soviet and Eastern European jamming.....	75
"Excerpts From the Transcript of the Conversation with Solzhenitsyn in Moscow," article from the New York Times, April 3, 1972.....	86

(III)

Insertions for the record—Continued	Page
Biographic sketch of Yuri Glazov.....	149
Prepared statement of Professor Roman Karst.....	150
Biographic sketch of Roman Karst.....	151
Prepared statement of Dr. Ilgvars J. Spilners.....	162
Appendix:	
Statement of Dr. Maury Lisann, Rockville, Md.....	169
Statement of the National Executive Committee of the Lithuanian American Community of the United States of America.....	171
Statement of Professor Eugen LoebL.....	172
Biography of Professor Eugen LoebL.....	173

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

TUESDAY, JUNE 12, 1973

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room 4221, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator J. W. Fulbright (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Fulbright, Aiken, Javits and Percy.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order. I hoped that the sponsors of this bill, Senator Percy and Senator Humphrey, would be here, but the President called a meeting at 11 and I have to get underway. So I will start the meeting even though they are not here. We expect them to come later.

OPENING STATEMENT

The committee meets this morning to hear testimony on S. 1914, an administration bill sponsored by Senators Humphrey and Percy to provide funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.
[The bill referred to follows:]

[S. 1914, 93d Cong., 1st sess.]

A BILL To provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting, to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that it is the policy of the United States to promote the right of freedom of opinion and expression, including the freedom "to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers," in accordance with article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

(2) that open communication of information and ideas among the peoples of the world contributes to international peace and stability, and that the promotion of such communication is in the interests of the United States;

(3) that Free Europe, Incorporated, and the Radio Liberty Committee, Incorporated (hereinafter referred to as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty), have demonstrated their effectiveness in furthering the open communication of information and ideas in Eastern Europe and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

(4) that the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as independent broadcast media, operating in a manner not inconsistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States and in accordance with high professional standards, is in the national interest; and

(1)

(5) that in order to provide an effective instrumentality for the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to encourage a constructive dialog with the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Eastern Europe, it is desirable to establish a Board for International Broadcasting.

ESTABLISHMENT AND ORGANIZATION

SEC. 3. (a) There is established a Board for International Broadcasting (hereinafter referred to as the "Board").

(b) (1) COMPOSITION OF BOARD.—The Board shall consist of seven members, two of whom shall be ex officio members. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, five voting members, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Not more than three of the members of the Board appointed by the President shall be of the same political party. The chief operating executive of Radio Free Europe and the chief operating executive of Radio Liberty shall be ex officio members of the Board and shall participate in the activities of the Board, but shall not vote in the determinations of the Board.

(2) SELECTION.—Members of the Board appointed by the President shall be citizens of the United States who are not concurrently regular full-time employees of the United States Government. Such members shall be selected by the President from among Americans distinguished in the fields of foreign policy or mass communications.

(3) TERM OF OFFICE OF PRESIDENTIALLY APPOINTED MEMBERS.—In appointing the initial voting members of the Board, the President shall designate three of the members appointed by him to serve for a term of three years and two members to serve for a term of two years. Thereafter, the term of office of each member of the Board so appointed shall be three years. The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, members to fill vacancies occurring prior to the expiration of a term, in which case the members so appointed shall serve for the remainder of such term. Any member whose term has expired may serve until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

(4) TERM OF OFFICE OF EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—Ex officio members of the Board shall serve on the Board during their terms of service as chief operating executives of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty.

(5) COMPENSATION.—Members of the Board appointed by the President shall, while attending meetings of the Board or while engaged in duties relating to such meetings or in other activities of the Board pursuant to this section, including travel time, be entitled to receive compensation equal to the daily equivalent of the compensation prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code. While away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5703) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently. Ex officio members of the Board shall not be entitled to any compensation under this act, but may be allowed travel expenses as provided in the preceding sentence.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 4. (a) The Board is authorized:

(1) to make grants to Radio Free Europe and to Radio Liberty in order to carry out the purposes set forth in section 2 of this Act;

(2) to review and evaluate the mission and operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and to assess the quality, effectiveness and professional integrity of their broadcasting within the context of the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States;

(3) to encourage the most efficient utilization of available resources by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to undertake, or request that Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty undertake, such studies as may be necessary to identify areas in which the operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty may be made more efficient and economical;

(4) to develop and apply such financial procedures, and to make such audits of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as the Board may determine are necessary, to assure that grants are applied in accordance with the purposes for which such grants are made;

(5) to develop and apply such evaluative procedures as the Board may determine are necessary to assure that grants are applied in a manner not

inconsistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States Government;

(6) to appoint such staff personnel as may be necessary, subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and to fix their compensation in accordance with the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates;

(7) (A) to procure temporary and intermittent personal services to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates not to exceed the daily equivalent of the rate provided for GS-18; and

(B) to allow those providing such services, while away from their homes or their regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed;

(8) to report annually to the President and the Congress on or before the 30th day of October, summarizing the activities of the Board during the year ending the preceding June 30, and reviewing and evaluating the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty during such year; and

(9) to prescribe such regulations as the Board deem necessary to govern the manner in which its functions shall be carried out.

(b) In carrying out the foregoing functions, the Board shall bear in mind the necessity of maintaining the professional independence and integrity of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

RECORDS AND AUDIT

SEC. 5. (a) The Board shall require that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty keep records which fully disclose the amount and disposition of assistance provided under this Act, the total cost of the undertaking or programs in connection with which such assistance is given or used, that portion of the cost of the undertaking or programs supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate effective audit.

(b) The Board and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty which, in the opinion of the Board or the Comptroller General, may be related or pertinent to the assistance provided under this Act.

ROLE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

SEC. 6. To assist the Board in carrying out its functions, the Secretary of State shall provide the Board with such information regarding the foreign policy of the United States as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

PUBLIC SUPPORT

SEC. 7. The Board is authorized to receive donations, bequests, devises, gifts, and other forms of contributions of cash, services, and other property, from persons, corporations, foundations, and all other groups and entities, both within the United States and abroad, and, pursuant to the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property for the carrying out of its functions. For the purposes of sections 170, 2055, and 2522 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended (26 U.S.C. 170, 2055, or 2522), the Board shall be deemed to be a corporation described in section 170(c)(2), 2055(a)(2), or 2522(a)(2) of the Code, as the case may be.

FINANCING

SEC. 8. (a). There are authorized to be appropriated, to remain available until expended, \$50,300,000 for fiscal year 1974 and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1975 to carry out the purposes of this Act. There are authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1974 and 1975 such additional or supplemental amounts as may be necessary for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law and for other nondiscretionary costs.

IMPLEMENTATION

(b) To allow for the orderly implementation of this Act, the Secretary of State is authorized to make grants to Radio Free Europe and to Radio Liberty under such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate for their continued operation until a majority of the voting members of the Board have been appointed and qualified, and until funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act are available to the Board.

PROVISIONS OF S. 1914

The CHAIRMAN. During the current fiscal year, fiscal year 1973, these two radios are operating under a grant from the Secretary of State of \$38.5 million, the amount authorized and appropriated by the Congress 1 year ago. The bill under consideration today would raise the level of annual funding for the radios—to \$50.3 million for fiscal year 1974, and for fiscal year 1975 would also allow an open ended authorization for radio expenditures.

In addition to these provisions, S. 1914 would establish a new seven-member board, to be called the board for international broadcasting, which when constituted would assume the responsibility of making grants to the radios and overseeing their operations, a responsibility which now resides with the Secretary of State. According to the bill, five of the board's members would be appointed by the President and subject to Senate confirmation, while the other two members would be the chief executives of the two radios, who would serve ex officio.

FINANCIAL HISTORY OF RADIOS

As the committee begins its consideration of this year's funding legislation for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, it may be useful to recapitulate very briefly the financial history of these two organizations. Both were established in the early 1950's as nonprofit corporations, legally incorporated in the United States and with operating headquarters in Munich, Germany. For two decades thereafter, both radios were believed by the American people to be operating on budgets financed wholly by charitable contributions. The reality, as we now know, was that the radios were financed almost entirely by funds secretly supplied by the Central Intelligence Agency, without public or even congressional approval. During that period, according to data later developed by the General Accounting Office, the two radios received nearly \$800 million of the taxpayers' money.

Fortunately, in 1972 this hidden drain on the Treasury was sealed by congressional action. Through legislation sponsored by Senator Case, U.S. Government financing of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty was brought into the open; and during fiscal year 1972 and thereafter, expenditures for the two radios have been subject to the traditional process of congressional authorization and appropriation.

CONCERN THAT EUROPEAN NATIONS SHARE FINANCIAL BURDEN

One year ago, as the Foreign Relations Committee deliberated over the funding of the radios for fiscal year 1973—the fiscal year now in progress—a principal area of concern expressed by committee members was the failure of any other nation to bear even a small share of the annual costs for either of the radios. During the hearings, several

of the Senators articulated this concern with eloquence. Senator Percy spoke forcefully when he said:

I feel that the time has long since passed when the United States should underwrite the total cost of projects which are done in the mutual interest of Western Europe and the United States.

Senator Javits also spoke clearly:

I think that we ought to carry it on for the year and give Europe the opportunity; but I would like to emphasize that if we do, there will be a real obligation on the part of Europeans . . . to see that this year is not wasted and that the collaborative effort which is called for is forthcoming.

At those same hearings, Dr. Dirk Stikker, the former Secretary General of NATO who was then chairman of the Western European Advisory Committee for Radio Free Europe, responded to a committee member by saying, "I personally fully agree with your stated view that it is time for West Europeans to begin sharing the financial burden of these radio operations."

My colleagues may also remember that I, myself, took the opportunity to add an additional word or two along these lines. Other Senators, including Senator Aiken, the ranking minority member of the committee, expressed similar views, and when the committee voted finally to authorize the full amount requested for the current fiscal year, it took care to express a clear warning. I quote from the committee report:

The committee's swift and decisive action to approve continued Government funding for the Radios through fiscal 1973 should be more than sufficient to indicate the U.S. commitment to the Radios. But this is not an open-ended commitment and the extent to which it continues in the future will be determined by the kind of financial support that can be generated during the coming year among the Western European nations.

With this background, we begin today to hear testimony on an administration bill through which, irrespective of the committee's warning of last year, the Congress and the American taxpayer are once again to be called upon to provide the full financing for both of these radio organizations—not, I note, for only 1 additional year, but in fact for 2 more years.

WITNESSES

Our first witness this morning is Mr. Kenneth Rush, Deputy Secretary of State, who will be accompanied by Mr. William Durkee, president of Radio Free Europe, and Mr. Howland Sargeant, president of Radio Liberty.

Our second witness, who will follow Mr. Rush, will be Dr. Milton Eisenhower, who directed a Presidential study commission on international broadcasting which recently submitted a report, with recommendations, regarding the future disposition of the radios.

U.S. FOREIGN BROADCASTING SPENDING

In addition to that statement, I wish simply for the record to point out that we are spending in foreign broadcasting for benefit of foreign people \$50 million for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Voice of America, which the committee granted, is \$56 million. That was the full amount requested except for the construction of a new facility in Korea, which is in addition to the \$56 million. That is for acquisition of permanent facilities. In addition to that, the Armed

Forces network has an admitted cost of \$27 million, which does not include a large part of their overhead.

To give some idea of the magnitude of the amount we are spending for broadcasting outside the United States, those three figures I have mentioned come to \$133 million. I am quite sure that the \$27 million for the Armed Forces does not include a vast amount of overhead which is paid for and carried under the operations of the military itself.

The Armed Forces broadcasting, for example, operates 376 radio stations and 103 television stations. This seems to me, in view of our financial situation both on balance of payments as well as our domestic budget, to be entirely out of proportion to the benefits that we receive from this type of activity. To put it in the usual way, the priorities for spending of \$130 million for foreign broadcasting are quite out of proportion. This is demonstrated further, I think, by recalling that the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for our own people is only \$45 million, less than even Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, not to mention the Voice of America and armed services network. So I am bound to say it is very difficult for me to see the justification for it.

Senator Percy, before you came in I quoted, with approval, a very eloquent statement that you made about this matter last year. I don't know whether you have a copy of it.

Do you wish to say anything as sponsor of the bill before we proceed with Mr. Rush?

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PERCY

Senator PERCY. Mr. Chairman, I very much appreciate your holding these hearings on short notice so that we can proceed with the authorization process.

I have concurred with certain of the positions that the chairman has taken, notably with respect to other governments sharing some portion of the cost. I am very grateful, as we begin these hearings today, that we can draw upon the expertise of the Presidential Commission appointed by President Nixon to study this matter which has submitted a brilliant, thorough report entitled "The Right To Know," sections of which I have inserted in the Congressional Record.

We do face priorities of spending. It is obvious as we look at the budget for our national security, our military assistance programs, our economical aid program, the USIA program. We have to try and weigh this \$50 million request against all other requirements.

I have concluded that, in the priorities of spending, this is some of the best spent money. It is money spent in an effort for better understanding in the world.

We have come a long way from the early 1950's when Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty engaged in cold war tactics. We have had many years of experience with a whole new approach which is appropriate to the world situation in the 1970's. Today we look forward very much to the testimony of Secretary Rush and that of Dr. Eisenhower who—at great personal sacrifice of which I am personally aware—undertook this study with a brilliant group of members of the Presidential Commission.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rush.

Senator PERCY. May I interject that Senator Humphrey gave a memorial service last evening in Chicago for our former colleague, Senator Benton, and has not yet arrived back in Washington. But he wanted me to express his regret for not being here at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Rush, will you proceed.

**STATEMENT OF HON. KENNETH RUSH, ACTING SECRETARY OF
STATE; ACCOMPANIED BY JOHN A. BAKER, DIRECTOR, OFFICE
OF EASTERN EUROPEAN AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF STATE**

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, it is an honor for me to appear before you in support of S. 1914, the Board for International Broadcasting bill. The purpose of this bill is to authorize continued Government grants in fiscal years 1974-75 in support of the broadcast of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to establish a sound mechanism for administering those grants. It is, in our view, the best way to make sure that these essential nonofficial radios maintain their professional independence while continuing to broadcast in a manner not inconsistent with broad U.S. foreign policy objectives.

SUPPORT FOR RADIOS

Just a little more than a year ago, there was a sharp debate over the current role of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in the present period. A number of views were expressed at that time, in the Congress and elsewhere, as to the present role of this type of broadcasting, the appropriate mechanism for providing support to the radios, and the possibility of broadening the base of financial support.

Over a period of several months, nearly 600 editorials favorable to continuation of the stations appeared in the American press while some 30 to 40 were unfavorable. Scores of distinguished private specialists in Communist affairs and international communications testified to the unique and valuable purpose served by the stations. In March 1972, a substantial number of Members of the Senate, 67 to be exact, cosponsored a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on this matter. In the resolution, they expressed their "intention to provide adequate support to these two radios while the methods for future support to these two radios are carefully examined within the framework of U.S. foreign policy objectives." By the end of March 1972, both Houses of the Congress had voted to continue Government grants to the stations for fiscal year 1972.

STUDY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RADIO

The President understood that support as a firm decision not to terminate these valuable broadcasting services without a careful examination of their function and relationship to the U.S. Government. In August 1972, he therefore appointed a Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting consisting of five distinguished Americans to study this matter and report their findings to him.

Dr. Milton Eisenhower, Chairman of the Commission, and his distinguished colleagues Edward W. Barrett, John A. Gronowski, Edmund A. Gullion, and John P. Roche, submitted their report "The Right To

Know" earlier this year and the President released it May 7 with a strong endorsement. They are here today to answer any questions on their findings. I would like to take this occasion to thank them for the very conscientious job they did, including the care with which they studied the working of the Radios in Munich.

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS OF STUDY COMMISSION REPORT

The principal findings of the report are embodied in the bill before this committee in paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 2. These state:

That the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as independent broadcast media, operating in a manner not inconsistent with the broad foreign policy objectives of the United States and in accordance with high professional standards, is in the national interests; and (5) that in order to provide an effective instrumentality for the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and to encourage a constructive dialogue with the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and Eastern Europe, it is desirable to establish a Board for International Broadcasting.

Anyone who believes that these radios are irrelevant or detrimental to the improved climate of East-West relations in the past few years or the prospects for further improvement should carefully study this report.

REASONS FOR COMMISSION'S FINDING

The reasons for the Commission's finding that the continuation of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe broadcasting is in the national interest are cogently argued in its report, especially on pages 26-29, which I would like to summarize briefly here and introduce in full into the record at this point, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

[The information referred to follows:]

[Excerpt from "The Right to Know." Report of the Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting.]

DÉTENTE AND THE CONTINUING NEED FOR RFE AND RL

It has been argued that recent improvements in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America dictate termination of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. Why continue an alleged irritant when things seem to be getting better? Why continue programs that were started in the Cold War period now that the Cold War is seemingly being replaced by serious efforts to increase détente?

The Commission is satisfied that the two radio operations have adjusted progressively to meet the requirements of changing times, that they do not operate to keep alive Cold War animosities, and that they can contribute to détente by adding to knowledge and understanding.

But the road to détente is a two-way street. A most important consideration for the future role of RFE and RL is the fact that Soviet and East European leaders and media have made it clear, even after the thaw in East-West relations began, that the principles of coexistence do not "offer possibilities of relaxing the ideological struggle." "On the contrary," Party leader Leonid Brezhnev stated at the time of Castro's visit to Moscow on June 27, 1972.

... we must be ready to see the (ideological) struggle intensify, become an ever sharper form of antagonism of two social systems. And we have no doubt in the outcome of this antagonism, for the truth of history, the objective laws of social development are on our side.

In reporting to Congress in June 1972, after his visit to the Soviet Union, President Nixon confirmed that the attitude of the Soviet leaders in this respect had not changed:

... We must remember that Soviet ideology still proclaims hostility to some of America's most basic values. The Soviet leaders remain committed to that ideology. Like the nation they lead, they are and will continue to be locally dedicated competitors of the United States.

Whether we like it or not, therefore, we must recognize that détente in relations with the outside world is for the communist governments by no means congruent with relaxation of restrictions, censorship, and all the other inhibitions which impede the right of their own people to be informed. We see this in the Soviet Union itself and typically in Romania, which pursues a fairly independent foreign policy but continues its restrictive policies inside its borders. In Poland, jamming has been reinstituted. It has continued in Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria. In recent debates in the United Nations General Assembly and UNESCO, the USSR has advocated the strictest censorship over international television by satellite.

Despite such developments, the Commission, after careful study, believes that the broadcasts of RFE and RL in recent years have not deterred but rather have contributed to the search for long-term détente that we witness today.

First of all, it is a fact that the recent improvement in East-West government relations has taken place while these stations were operating and some communist governments were denouncing them bitterly. Furthermore, the Soviet Union apparently does not think its own international broadcasts have a damaging effect. After all, it devotes a major effort—as described in Section II of this report—to the conduct of what it continues to call its “ideological struggle against imperialism.” The West has not objected and should not object in view of its acceptance of the principle of the free flow of information.

The Commission believes that peace is more secure in well-informed societies and that uninformed societies may more easily be manipulated in directions threatening world peace. Access to information is necessary to East European societies in order that citizens there may form sound and responsible judgments about their own and world affairs.

The two radios, by providing a flow of free information and interpretation, have enabled the peoples to whom they broadcast to remain informed and to judge for themselves which policies may contribute to social change and genuine improvement of peaceful relations.

These stations are dedicated to providing full information to peoples who otherwise would be deprived of it. They have informed their audiences of developments and conditions in the world outside. They have conducted extensive research to provide these peoples with news and authoritative interpretations of events within their own countries which otherwise they would not have received. Ample testimony supports the claim that RFE and RL are regarded by many of their listeners as “our radio.”

In the post-Stalin period, East European party leaders, while seeking to maintain their control, sometimes by means of coercion, have been obliged increasingly to take popular “pressures” into consideration. They can no longer manufacture history to suit their needs. Brezhnev, for instance, felt it necessary to justify the invasion of Czechoslovakia; Stalin, in contrast, never felt compelled to explain or justify anything—he operated in an air-tight public opinion vacuum.

The Commission, therefore, is confident that the radios, by providing information and interpretation, will continue to be of help in future negotiations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in such areas as strategic arms limitation, trade, European security, and environmental protection.

The Commission has also addressed itself to the question of how long RFE and RL must or should continue. It is our judgment that until the Soviet Union and East European countries change their attitudes and permit a free flow of truthful information, it is in the interests of the United States for the stations to continue. It may be envisioned that one or the other of the RFE audience countries will progress in its “relaxation” policy to such a degree as to permit discontinuation of broadcasts in that country's language. Such a change in the Soviet Union is probably more remote. The Commission feels that plans for the stations should be of a long-range nature, and the recommendations in the following sections are made on that basis. However, the Executive Branch and the Congress must remain alert to changes within the countries to which the stations broadcast and review the situation at regular intervals.

RADIOS' OPERATION IN VIEW OF EAST-WEST DÉTENTE

Mr. RUSH. Addressing itself to the viewpoint that recent improvements in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States dictated termination of the two radios, the Commission stated:

The Commission is satisfied that the two radio operations have adjusted progressively to meet the requirements of changing times, that they do not operate to keep alive cold war animosities, and that they contribute to détente by adding to knowledge and understanding.

The report pointed out that Soviet and East European leaders and media have made it clear, even after the thaw in East-West relations began, that the principals of coexistence do not "offer possibilities of relaxing the ideological struggle." The President, in his June 1972 report to Congress on his visit to the Soviet Union, called attention to the fact that "Soviet ideology still proclaims hostility to some of America's most basic values," and that Soviet leaders "will continue to be totally dedicated competitors of the United States."

The recent improvement in East-West relations has taken place while the stations have been operating, the report pointed out, and the Soviet Union apparently does not think its own major effort of "ideological struggle against imperialism" is damaging to such relations.

The Commission pointed to the efforts of the two radios to keep their audiences fully informed on events both in the world outside and within their own countries, and it considered that East European leaders have been obliged increasingly to take popular "pressures" into consideration. The Commission said it was confident that the radios, by providing information and interpretation, "will continue to be of help in future negotiations and cooperation between the Soviet Union and the United States in such areas as strategic arms limitation, trade, European security, and environmental protection."

The Commission concluded that it is in the interests of the United States that the stations continue until the Soviet Union and East European countries permit a free flow of truthful information.

RADIOS' EFFECT ON DÉTENTE

Mr. Chairman, the welcome readiness of the Soviet leadership to enter into agreements relating to arms control and to seek a reduction of tension in Europe is not the result of a change of heart or of ideology. It is related very directly to the increasing need recognized by them and by leaders in Eastern Europe to meet the rising demands of their peoples for a fuller, more satisfying daily existence, more nearly comparable to that enjoyed by Europeans in the West. This is, I strongly believe, a highly positive development. We will shortly welcome the Soviet leader Mr. Brezhnev to Washington to pursue the fruitful dialog the President started with him last year on issues of arms control, broader exchanges, and trade. We have good reasons of U.S. national interest to encourage this trend, and to maintain and broaden the dialog with the leaders of Eastern Europe as well.

We have, in view of their important role in this process, equally good reasons for maintaining a dialog with the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe by means of radio broadcasting. Until there is a considerably freer movement of persons from East to West, a consider-

ably greater range of human contacts, and a considerably broader internal dissemination of information and opinion to the peoples of these countries, international radio broadcasting will remain the principal source of information and analyses about the current negotiations in Europe. While they can receive international news and analyses from official Western radios (like the Voice of America), the real meaning of détente to them is its effect and this gets into areas difficult to handle in official broadcasting. These people want to know the relationship between détente and the improvement of their own conditions of life. They want to know how their own Government's priorities are affected. They want to know how the opportunities provided by an era of negotiation are being used by their leaders. They want to know if they are to receive only some material benefits from détente and be deprived of most of the nonmaterial benefits such as freer movement, more varied and complete information. These are some of the significant issues relevant to the aspirations of these peoples for a meaningful and lasting détente, not one which can be turned on and off for temporary political advantage. These are the issues to which Radio Free Europe's experienced newsmen and analysts have been giving their greatest attention, the issues on which Radio Liberty has broadcast, during the past year, a significant body of analytical material emanating from independent thinkers in the Soviet Union whose product otherwise receives very little circulation. This is the type of information which is not and should not be analyzed in detail by the Voice of America, the official international broadcaster of the U.S. Government.

Does the broadcasting of information about and analyses of events inside the Communist world disrupt détente? Certainly, the Soviet leaders and some of the leaders of Eastern Europe would prefer to have a monopoly of the channels of information to their people. In all cases, except Hungary and Romania, they continue to jam these broadcasts. But there is absolutely no evidence that their continuation has slowed the evolution of détente. On the contrary, we believe these important channels of communication to the peoples of the area have contributed to this process, and that their continuation will help keep that process from being a short-term phenomenon. The degree to which our allies and other non-Communist states in Europe share our view of the importance of a freer exchange of ideas and information and closer human contacts to a meaningful process of détente has been amply demonstrated in the preparatory talks in Helsinki for the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. At general Western insistence, provision has been made at Helsinki for these matters to be highlighted in a major agenda item at the Conference, and in a way which should provide an opportunity to negotiate specific practical improvements.

WHY ESTABLISH BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL BROADCASTING?

Mr. Chairman, I anticipate that some might quite logically ask at this point: Why, then, do not the Europeans participate in the financial support of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, and why is it that the United States must now establish a Board for International Broadcasting to supervise their financing?

These are legitimate questions. On the matter of the Board, I believe the Commission's report speaks persuasively in favor of it. The

Commissioners can, I believe, further elaborate their rationale. It is convincing to us precisely because we believe that the Commission correctly identified the objectives governing the U.S. Government's relationship with the radios, and I would like here to cite those listed on pages 37-38 of their report and enter them in the record :

The professional independence and hence the credibility and effectiveness of the stations must be preserved.

Organizational arrangements and procedures must be such as to insure that publicly funded facilities are not used in a manner inconsistent with U.S. foreign policy objectives.

The organizational structure should permit the use of funds from American and non-American sources, both public and private, and must provide for appropriate accountability. All funds should be openly provided and publicly reported.

The organizational structure should be shaped to stimulate maximum efficiency and economy in the operations of the stations.

Since the condition of free movement of information into and within the Soviet sphere, which could make the stations unnecessary, is not likely to be achieved soon, the organizational structure should be sufficiently strong and flexible to serve for at least a decade, if necessary.

The report makes clear why a small Board for International Broadcasting is the best way to meet these objectives.

EUROPEAN FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR RADIOS

There was substantial sentiment expressed in this committee a year ago in favor of European financial support for RFE and RL. The Department concluded at that time, however, that formal approaches to European governments by the United States should await thorough consideration of the matter by the Presidential Study Commission.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to inform you that, with the President's endorsement of the Commission's recommendations, we have moved to encourage strongly the participation of European governments in the financing of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe research. Furthermore, the annual corporate fundraising drive of the Radio Free Europe Fund is underway, and we expect this will be supplemented this year by efforts of Radio Liberty.

With respect to European support from private sources, a group of leading private citizens established last year the West European Advisory Committee on the Free Flow of Information and is now in the process of exploring the possibilities and methods of seeking private contributions in Europe.

We do not know at this point whether governments which decide to support the radios research will wish to do so directly—in exchange for research produced—through the European nongovernmental fundraising body, through a Board for International Broadcasting, or through other bilateral or multilateral instrumentalities of their own choosing. But the board, as proposed in section 7 of the bill before you will have among its competences the right to receive contributions and to use them for the purposes of the bill. I believe that a small board of distinguished citizens with few administrative expenses and functions limited to those outlined in section 4 of the bill would be, in the eyes of any nongovernmental or foreign contributors, a preferable recipient of contributions to a large U.S. Government department which has a wide range of functions and responsibilities.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot at this point predict what success we will

have in raising funds from the above described sources for the two radios, especially since the action taken by Congress will have a significant bearing on these efforts. Given the best of circumstances, I do not expect that we can, in the coming year, reach a high level of European participation. The Commission, for reasons outlined in its report, recommended that the effort with foreign governments focus on the radios' excellent research product, which many of them have used for years at little or no cost. Should we succeed during the coming year in raising sufficient funds in this way to finance research fully, we would be able to reduce cost to the U.S. Government of the radios in fiscal year 1975. We would hope to raise additional funds from nongovernmental sources here and abroad which could be used to reduce demands for U.S. Government expenditure on the radios. We are prepared, if it appears appropriate, to consider the use of contributed nongovernmental funds for operating costs or for transmitter improvement as well as for research depending on the wishes of the donor and the needs. We hope to lessen in every way we can, including the proposed board's function of searching for economies, the burden on the U.S. taxpayer. But we share the basic judgment in the report that we must realistically see these radios as an activity which will continue to be largely U.S. financed. In looking to the principle of burden sharing for a reduction of U.S. costs, we must obviously place our emphasis in our approaches to Europe on the much more significant area of defense costs.

INCREASED FUNDING REQUEST

I do not wish to avoid the fact that, as in the case of European defense costs, devaluation has made these radio operations more expensive for us. This is clear already in the fiscal year, during which the February realignment of currencies has obliged us to seek the authorization request, now before you, for a \$1.8 million supplemental appropriation for RFE and RL for the present year. The \$50.3 million funding request for fiscal year 1974 contains \$31.6 million for RFE, \$18.3 million for RL and \$275,000 for the Board for International Broadcasting proposed in the legislation. The radio figures do not provide for any increase in present goods, personnel or new equipment—other than replacement equipment—but will maintain the same level of programing as fiscal year 1973.

The increase over the radios fiscal year 1973 costs—\$9.6 million—is needed for the following reasons:

- (1) We need to meet increased costs estimated at \$3.5 million caused by the dollar devaluation. The radios spend over 80 percent of their budgets in foreign currencies.
- (2) We must reinstate or partially restore payments to pension plans of \$2.4 million which went unfunded in the prior 2 years due to insufficient funds.
- (3) We need to cover normal wage and price increases which will total \$3.2 million given the rising salary scales both here and in Germany attributable to the impact of inflation.
- (4) Expenditures to maintain equipment and facilities will require an added \$500,000.

The radios, a significant factor adding to the pressures which moved the U.S.S.R. toward a policy of reduced tensions in Europe, can be maintained for less than the price of four F-14's.

PRICE OF RADIOS WORTH PAYING

I think that there is no question that this is a price worth paying. While we should definitely seek a European participation in the manner outlined by the Presidential Commission, we should be clear in our own minds that we are supporting an activity definitely in our own interest. We are supporting an activity whose cost, in the burden-sharing context, is not comparable to the much more significant defense cost sharing we are seeking. We are supporting an activity which, not just in our view but also in the view of authoritative spokesmen for the Communist side, is not in conflict with an era of negotiation.

Tamas Palos, deputy head of the Agitation and Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party, quite explicitly stated the Communist case in a Budapest Radio Symposium last November 21:

If we want the support of the masses, if we want them to be convinced of our truth, then we must tell them this truth. Thus, mobilization—within the country but also on an international scale—requires an intensified ideological struggle * * * The intensification of the ideological struggle is a normal development under conditions of peaceful coexistence. Because, what is peaceful coexistence? Countless relations, and these countless relations have an ideological basis * * * Thus, the ideological struggle goes hand in hand with peaceful coexistence. Therefore, it is in our interest that this ideological struggle be expanded.

I do not quote Mr. Palos to argue for the expansion of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty broadcasting. I quote him to demonstrate that we are talking about a type of activity which our Communist negotiating partners could hardly disclaim as incompatible with the present period. The unrestricted sale of Soviet newspapers and magazines in the West continues. The distribution of Soviet assessments in the Daily Worker in the United States goes on. The support rendered by the Soviet Union to Communist parties abroad in the name of "proletarian internationalism," has not stopped. Moscow radio's substantial broadcasting continues to be supplemented by the so-called "unofficial" Soviet station "peace and progress." The weekly 250 hours continues to be beamed to North America by Eastern European and Soviet radios in English and in languages familiar to ethnic groups here. Moscow domestic media continue to give a picture of America, according to the New York Times correspondent in Moscow on June 1, which portrays it as—and I quote "a land of racism, social injustice, unemployment, crime, violence and youth unrest."

The myriad channels of communication in the U.S. and in the West open to the Soviets and their allies are full of evidence that they do not consider the flow of information from East to West to be in contradiction with their concept of peaceful coexistence or of détente. Therefore, we need not be self-conscious or anxious about the continuation of radio broadcasting by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. We need only consider whether it continues to be in our interest. Our own most experienced academicians, diplomats, and journalists reach the

conclusion that it is not the time to reduce the free flow of information from West to East. A report by the Atlantic Council's Advisory Committee on CSCE [Conference on Security and Cooperation In Europe] and MBFR [Mutual and Balanced Force Reduction] issued last November stated, in the section on freedom of communication, that:

A weighty argument for retaining the stations, in our opinion, would be that East-West relations have improved significantly over the past 10 years while these stations were operating and caused a demonstrable measure of political liberalization in the Soviet bloc countries in which their broadcasts have a wide audience. It should be kept in mind that the East European party rulers formulate their policies under popular pressures, even while they seek to maintain their control by means of coercion.

To abolish these radio stations now in the interest of improving the political environment would be to deprive the peoples of Eastern Europe of the truth and of their communication with the West, but more importantly, it would return to the Communist regimes the monopoly of communication in their countries. It is very likely that this would result in a regression of Communist domestic policies toward totalitarianism. In this context, any improvement which the abandonment of these Western broadcasting stations might bring to East-West relations would probably prove shallow in the long run. European security cannot be served by the re-isolation of Eastern Europe.

The Washington Post summed it up soundly and succinctly when it said:

Détente, if it means anything, means widening the West's contacts with the East, not helping the East seal off its people from the West. It means the exchange of people, goods, words and ideas. This is the essential business of RFE and RL.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, that is a very thorough and extensive statement. I don't know that you left out anything.

LETTERS FROM MR. JAN NOWAK

I notice you note that there have been a lot of editorials in support of these radios; is that right?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, do you know Mr. Jan Nowak, N-o-w-a-k? Do you know who he is or was?

Mr. RUSH. I don't know him personally.

The CHAIRMAN. We have letters from him. He was Chief of the Polish desk of Radio Free Europe. Do you have anyone with you who could identify him?

Mr. RUSH. He is Chief of the Polish Broadcasting Department, Radio Free Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. Some letters have come to our attention which might bear upon the extensive nature of these editorials inspired, I think, by Mr. Nowak. They carry on quite a campaign in defense of the radios. These arose after the discussion of Radio Free Europe last year and particularly Senator Case's statement.

This is a letter on Radio Free Europe stationery, Division of Free Europe, Incorporated, and it is from Munich, dated September 1972. I will put it in the record. We have it translated. I have the original and the translation by the Library of Congress. These were disseminated in this country.

I will read part of it, but it is all available to you. This followed after this matter arose last year.

It bothers me that the sponsors of the whole liquidation action, Senators Fulbright and Case, quieted down only temporarily in order to take the next best opportunity to bring up the matter again and seek revenge on Radio Free Europe for their shameful defeat.

Senator Fulbright's pro-Communist sympathies do not surprise those who know his past, as he made his first foreign trip after the completion of his education to no other place but Moscow.

Incidentally, I note that isn't true. But anyway, this is his statement.

It might be worthwhile to project this fact in a proper way.

I guess by using Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

The attempt to give up further operation of our radio stations also means that many of our people who for many years loyally served American interests would lose their jobs. As you see, I am not interested in my own interest but am concerned about others who rendered us their valuable services.

On the next page he says:

Furthermore, one should exert influence on the American Polonia and on wide masses of American people to prevent Mr. Case, whose term in office ends on January 31, 1973, from being reelected to the Senate. The stupidity of Messrs. Fulbright and Case should be implanted in American public opinion as extensively as possible. Some people tend to overlook the danger of the deceiving gestures of the regime [that is, the Polish Government] towards Polonia, and Mr. Fulbright is ready to render services to that regime in the first place. I hope that the leadership of American Polonia will act properly to deprive of every political influence people who do not have American interest at heart.

This letter was addressed apparently to a newspaper in Milwaukee, 1201 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

I guess there are quite a number of Polonia in Chicago and in Illinois.

I expect there are a number of Poles in this country, aren't there?

Do you know how many people there are of Polish descent in this country?

Senator PERCY. I can tell you exactly how many Polish Americans there are in Chicago. There are 800,000 Polish Americans in the city of Chicago, which we are proud to call the second largest Polish city in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. This is Redaktor Jan Krawiec—I am bad on Polish—and “Dziennik Zwiazkowy,” if that means anything to you. But the address is there.

There is another letter, a shorter one, in May of 1972. I won't read it all, but it is interesting.

“I am forwarding to you the text of the article which appeared in “Nowy Dziennik” [the New Daily, Jersey City] on May 18. It would be very important to have “Dziennik Zwiazkowy” reprint this article. Under separate cover I am writing to Mr. Sikora in this matter, hoping he will repeat it in his radio [program].”

This is directed to Jersey City.

Senator Case conducts a two-faced politics in our case and is the main source of our trouble. While he hides behind Fulbright's back, he in fact supports his efforts to liquidate the two radio stations.

LETTERS AS INSPIRATION FOR EDITORIALS AND ARTICLES SUGGESTED

You don't suppose these letters were the inspiration for all of those editorials and articles that you referred to?

Mr. RUSH. I think they had nothing to do with it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You don't think they did. He seems to think they did.

MR. JAN NOWAK'S LETTERS

Then the last one.

I am concerned about the fact that our sponsors basically accepted Fulbright's idea that Western European countries should participate in the financing of the two broadcasting stations. It is known already now that this will not materialize. In my opinion, this principle should have been attacked instantly. Fulbright does not demand that Western Europe participate, e.g., in the financing of the cultural exchange.

[The letters referred to follow:]

RADIO FREE EUROPE,
DIVISION OF FREE EUROPE INC.,

Munich, Germany, Monachium, dnia 29-go urzeźnia 1972 r.

Seisle Poufne—Osobiste.

WPan

Redaktor JAN KRAWIEC,

"Dziennik Zwazkowcy,"

1201, Milwaukee Ave.,

Chicago 22, Ill., 60622

Szanowny Panie Redaktorze.

[The Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, translation (Polish)]

Thank you very much for your comforting letter. I am replying right away which does not happen too often due to my great work load.

The matters which you mention in your letter not only trouble us but also take a lot of our time which we need badly to maintain normal work and a proper level of our broadcasts.

The situation in our editorial department has not improved a bit in spite of President Nixon's assurances and the great support which was afforded to our cause by the majority of prominent personalities of the U.S.A. and a considerable part of the American community.

Bitter experience makes us continue in our efforts to maintain this good will and to gain new friends whom we badly need.

Personally, I am putting forth maximum effort in the defense of the radio station, and am trying to use all available means and way to get in touch with influential people in order to convince them about the necessity of maintaining Radio Free Europe in its present form.

With some bitterness, I must confess that I am not always successful in the above efforts, probably due to the instability of human convictions, to the effects of everything that comes with the so called "progress of civilization", and, naturally, due to the nearsightedness of some primitive thinking politicians who fully believe in the tales of co-existence, detente, Communist good will and other nonsense like this.

One is greatly surprised to see that America listens to and tolerates this kind of political ignorance.

It bothers me that the sponsors of the whole liquidation action, Senators Fulbright and Case, quieted down only temporarily in order to take the next best opportunity to bring up the matter again and seek revenge on Radio Free Europe for their shameful defeat.

Senator Fulbright's pro-Communist sympathies do not surprise those who know his past, as he made his first foreign trip after the completion of his education to no other place but Moscow. It might be worth while to project this fact in a proper way.

The attempt to give up further operation of our Radio stations, also means that many of our people who for many years loyally served American interests would lose their jobs. As you see, I am not interested in my own interest but am concerned about others who rendered us their valuable services.

This situation does not permit us to just wait idly, especially since distinct courting of American Poles [Polonia] by both Parties is evident.

Therefore, I repeat once more, the most important thing at this time is the inclusion of the demand to keep up Radio Free Europe in the electoral platforms of both, the Republicans and the Democrats.

Already in June, I asked the editors, Leszczynski and Sikora, to get active in this respect. Furthermore one should exert influence on the American Polonia and on wide masses of American people, to prevent Mr. Case whose term in office ends on January 3, 1973, from being re-elected to the Senate. The stupidity of Messrs. Fulbright and Case should be implanted in American public opinion as extensively as possible. Some people tend to overlook the danger of the deceiving gestures of the regime [Polish Government] towards Polonia [American Poles] and Mr. Fulbright is ready to render services to that regime in the first place. I hope that the leadership of American Polonia will act properly to deprive of every political influence people who do not have American interest at heart.

I hope to hear from you soon about at least partial results of this difficult undertaking.

Heartfelt regards,

[Translated by George Starosolsky, amc.]

JAN NOWAK.

RADIO FREE EUROPE,
DIVISION OF FREE EUROPE, INC.,

Munich, Germany, Monachium, dn. 19 maja 1962 r.

WPan

ANTONI J. LESZCZYŃSKI,
3635 N. Green View Avenue,
Chicago, Ill., 60622.
Drogi Panie Redaktorze.

[The Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, translation (Polish)]

I am forwarding to you the text of the article which appeared in "Nowy Dziennik" [The New Daily] (Jersey City) on May 18th. It would be very important to have "Dziennik Zwiazkowy" reprint this article. Under separate cover, I am writing to Mr. Sikora in this matter, hoping, that he will repeat it in his radio (program). Senator Case conducts a two-faced politics in our case and is the main source of our trouble. While he hides behind Fulbright's back, he in fact supports his efforts to liquidate the two Radio Stations.

Cordial regards,

[Translated by George Starosolsky, amc.]

JAN NOWAK.

RADIO FREE EUROPE,
DIVISION OF FREE EUROPE INC.,

Munich, Germany, Monachium, dn. 13 czerwca 1972 r.

Poufne—Osobist.

WPan

ANTONI J. LESZCZYŃSKI,
1201 Milwaukee Avenue,
Chicago, Illinois 60622.
Drogi Panie Redaktorze.

[The Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, translation (Polish)]

Thank you very much for your letter of June 1st. I am replying to it on the eve of my departure for a month's vacation.

As you surely know, Fulbright suffered a bad defeat in his own Committee. There is nothing now to threaten the continuation of our Radio during the next fiscal year. Afterwards its future will depend on the results of the presidential election and the formation of international situation. I am concerned about the fact that our sponsors basically accepted Fulbright's idea that western-European countries should participate in the financing of the two broadcasting stations. It is known already now that this will not materialize. In my opinion, this principle should have been attacked instantly. Fulbright does not demand that Western Europe participate e.g. in the financing of the cultural exchange, nor do the British propose that America pay for BBC. If Radio Free Europe serves long-range interests of America, there is no justification for asking other countries for money. I am afraid that, in a year, we are going to have a lot of trouble with this matter.

Therefore, at this time, it is of utmost importance that the matter of the continuation of the two Broadcasting Stations be included in the electoral platforms

of both Parties: the Republican and the Democratic. I hope that the leadership of Polonia [American Poles] will act to this effect.

I would be grateful to you for conveying these remarks to Mr. Krawiec, the Editor. Also please inform him that yesterday, on Monday, June 12, we broadcast to Poland his interesting interview with Wagner.

Please accept my best regards. I hope to have the opportunity next year to visit Chicago and to thank you and many others personally.

[Translated by George Starosolsky, amc.]

JAN NOWAK.

MR. NOWAK'S LETTER

The CHAIRMAN. He is not only wrong on his statements but utterly wrong on his facts. Take Germany, for instance. They pay as much for the cultural exchange program, if not more, than we do, more than half. You know that. So this is a good example of the truth that you are spreading all over the world.

Here is the Chief of your Bureau writing this to American newspapers and citizens of America to influence them in this matter. I don't know how much further you can go in the distortion of the truth.

Senator AIKEN. What was the date?

The CHAIRMAN. This was last year. This matter was under discussion.

Mr. RUSH. That was not Radio Free Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. This was last year when we raised the matter here concerning which I quoted before the remarks Senator Percy and others made with regard to the matter of European participation. Here are the letters with a translation by Mr. George Starosolsky of the Library of Congress, if any of you wish to read them all. I think this is typical, of course, of what happens. I sympathize with anybody who might lose their job. That is always a sad occurrence, but I must say this kind of propaganda is a rather unusual way to go about saving the job. If they will do that to the people of America, I don't know what they would do to the Eastern Europeans. It certainly is difficult to reconcile it with your assertion that all we are interested in is spreading the truth.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. It has no relation to the truth, that I can think of.

Mr. RUSH. This was not Radio Free Europe; this was an individual, a private individual.

The CHAIRMAN. No; he is not, he is an employee. It states there. You stated yourself he is the Chief of the Polish Desk of Radio Free Europe.

Mr. RUSH. He was spreading his own personal opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. It is their stationery. It is not a private letter. It is on the regular stationery.

Mr. RUSH. He had no right whatever to use the stationery. He has been reprimanded for doing so. He was completely outside the bounds in using the stationery.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is Radio Europe if it is not the people who operate it?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir, this is right. But he was not speaking, just as many people do not speak, for their employer. He was expressing his personal opinions, and we cannot censor his personal opinions. Since he is not a government employee, he has a right to do so. But he was not speaking for Radio Free Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you do with him? Did you fire him?

Mr. RUSH. They reprimanded him.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you fire him?

Mr. RUSH. He has not been fired.

The CHAIRMAN. Is he still working for them?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir.

MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

The CHAIRMAN. Of course he is. You say who is Radio Europe. I notice on the Commission, they are all very outstanding men, particularly the Chairman, Mr. Milton Eisenhower. But it is interesting that Mr. Barrett, who is an excellent man, and I consider him a friend and high class man, but still he was Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs and head of the USIA. He was sort of brought up on the idea that government propaganda is a good thing.

Mr. Gronouski is an excellent man, a high class gentleman, but he was former Ambassador to Poland, wasn't he?

Mr. RUSH. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He would, I am sure, sympathize with Mr. Nowak's ideas about what he called Polonia. I understand the word means the Polish people in America. That is the way he used that word.

Mr. Gullion, also an extremely distinguished and fine man, was our Ambassador. They are hardly people disassociated with the processes of the Department of State in the cold war. They played a very important part in it, a very distinguished part. I wouldn't for the moment suggest they are not thoroughgoing patriots in every respect, but we are dealing with matters of opinion as to whether this is in the interest of this country and I am bound to say I don't think the attack upon Senator Case is justified.

FULL INQUIRY INTO MATTER SUGGESTED

Senator PERCY. Mr. Chairman, before we close on this particular question, I would like to state that I would trust that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty as institutions would not be judged in any way by the actions of one individual.

I would very much appreciate the record at this point being left open so that we can determine the whole truth of this matter, how many letters Mr. Nowak wrote, whether it was an extensive campaign by him, who authorized such reprehensible action. I have been the subject of this kind of attack in my own political career and I simply can't describe my feelings toward people who use such tactics.

I wonder also if any laws were broken. Did he actually hinder Senator Case's campaign for reelection while a Government employee? And I would very much appreciate a full and complete report being put in the hearing record just as soon as it can be assembled. If the facts warrant, the reprimand given Mr. Nowak should be strong enough so that this kind of activity is never again carried on by any employee of Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty.

[The information referred to follows:]

DEPARTMENT OF STATE STATEMENT CONCERNING MR. JAN NOWAK'S LETTERS

The Department of State has reviewed the two letters mentioned above to Mr. Antoni J. Leszczynski, dated May 19, 1973 and June 13, 1973, written by

an employee of Radio Free Europe, and has determined that the employee involved did not violate the Hatch Act or other federal law. He was not an employee of the United States Government, but of Free Europe, Inc. However, the Department agrees with the management of Free Europe, Inc., that in urging political actions, and using the official stationery of RFE for this purpose, the employee acted improperly. The employee has been reprimanded and cautioned against any repetition of such acts.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Percy, you see, due to the deceptive way in which these radios were created these are private corporations, which have been funded by the CIA, as you know. Technically he is not a Government employee; he is an employee of a private corporation. This gives him a buffer against the violation of law. The Department of State people, some several of them, are up here almost daily—I didn't mean to pick out the Department of State—lobbying the Congress. That would be a violation of law.

Senator PERCY. During the period that these letters were written, these were Government funds.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a private corporation given money, I think, by the CIA. It is Government money all right, but they create the corporation. I said technically. I agree with you that in any other sense than pure technicality they are Government employees.

Senator PERCY. I would like to know whether, when Federal funds are used, any Federal statute is violated in this regard.

The CHAIRMAN. I hope you will inquire into it. I think if you will inquire into it sufficiently you will change your views about the utility of the organization.

Mr. RUSH. These are not Government employees. Nevertheless, this was absolutely unacceptable in every sense, and I can assure you we will cooperate in every way to investigate this fully. We do not have the right, of course, to censor what individuals do as private individuals, not being Government employees. We certainly don't endorse this in any sense. It should be thoroughly looked into. The man has been reprimanded and we will thoroughly investigate the facts, report them to you, Mr. Chairman, and your committee, and you, Senator Percy, and we will take what further action seems appropriate.

WAS MR. NOWAK'S LETTERWRITING WIDESPREAD?

Senator PERCY. Do you happen to know whether this was a widespread campaign of letterwriting by Mr. Nowak or whether he happened to have personal friends to whom he wrote personal letters and inadvertently used official stationery for them?

Mr. RUSH. I do not have that information. So far as we know it was not a widely broadcast thing and I understand that the letters really turned up in a newspaper in Poland. They were purloined somehow and turn up in a sordid sense in a Polish newspaper. This is the only place any of them were published that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. We have a lot of knowledge now about how these things are done. They never know about them, of course, until you get somebody like the Washington Post on them.

Who is going to expose them? Are you going to take off from all your other duties and look into this? This isn't that important.

Senator PERCY. Well, I think it is important if the implication is left on the record that the hundreds of favorable editorials were all

achieved in this manner. I do not think that is actually the case. I think also there is a perfectly legitimate basis for public information officers of Radio Free Europe to make information available to newspapers. It is no different than a press secretary of a U.S. Senator bringing to the attention of press in his own State favorable things that the Senator has done, hoping to elicit favorable editorials at election time or whenever it may be. I think there is a legitimate use of public information and an illegitimate use. I consider this particular approach a very, very bad one which should be condemned and I hope that it is not in any way a common practice.

LOBBYING BY AGENCIES SUPPORTED BY TAX FUNDS QUESTIONED

The CHAIRMAN. There are all sorts of ways of getting favorable letters. We had a precedent: how many favorable responses there were to the President's bombing. We get all kinds of ads and letters and so on. This can be done and it isn't uncommon. But for the Senator to suggest that the agencies supported by tax funds are free to lobby across the country and in the Congress for the perpetuation of their programs in the same way that his office works for him, I don't think is justified. I wouldn't accept that. In fact, there is a current law on the books, law which prohibits the various agencies in the executive branch lobbying the Congress for their particular programs.

They can respond to requests for information, but they are not supposed to lobby. They do it every day. I am not suggesting they don't. This has become a habit because of the lax attitude toward the enforcement of the law. Letters are often sent to us. There was one on my desk yesterday, I think, about the State Department, seeking to influence us on an amendment to the current bill before the Senate on the State Department authorization which was, I think, clearly in violation of the law.

That is just one aspect of it. But is it not difficult to not only influence editorials but to influence elections in this country by methods of this kind. There is not much doubt about that. None of us should be surprised at it. But what I object to is that we are paying for it. This man's salary is paid by tax money, taxes you and I pay. It is true it is done through a grant through the State Department. It is a roundabout way, but he is on the tax payroll. We pay the salaries, as he says, of him and his colleagues who are concerned about their jobs. That is natural about anybody. We all are. But I don't think it is quite the same as an employee of the Senator from Illinois' office.

EASTERN EUROPEAN LACK OF ACCESS TO INFORMATION QUESTIONED

Today, not including the Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, the principal official Western European stations broadcast to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, a weekly total of 822 program hours in many languages. These stations are the Voice of America, the BBC, official radios of France, West Germany, Italy, Vatican, Israel, and RIAS [Radio In American Sector Berlin.] That is our radio in Berlin. In the light of this broadcasting barrage, isn't it a bit excessive to portray the people of Eastern Europe as being held captive in a prison and ignorant of events without access to information, Mr. Secretary?

It seems to me 822 hours a week is quite enough. It is considerably more than you state that the Russians broadcast. That is in addition to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Mr. RUSH. The Russians and Eastern European Governments beam about 1,900 program hours a week in about 84 languages, of which 250 hours are being beamed toward this country.

The CHAIRMAN. You said 250 toward this country?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir, toward Europe and all other countries about 1,900 per week.

These stations, RFE and RL, have the transmitters and have the means of reaching large quantities of people in the Communist bloc countries, including Russia. We estimate that some 30 million people listen to Radio Free Europe broadcasts and are deeply affected.

BASIS OF ESTIMATE OF RFE LISTENERS

The CHAIRMAN. You can estimate anything you want.

You could estimate 50 million and I couldn't deny it. You have no basis really for that other than an estimate.

Mr. RUSH. Yes, we do. These are independent surveys.

The CHAIRMAN. That you make?

Mr. RUSH. That this is the case.

The CHAIRMAN. Who makes the surveys?

Mr. RUSH. Those are checks that are made.

The CHAIRMAN. Who made the surveys?

Mr. RUSH. By seven respected and established West European polling organization among a cross-section of several thousand East Europeans. They were West European polling organizations, not Radio Free Europe itself.

The CHAIRMAN. Who financed it?

Mr. RUSH. I assume they were paid for just as anyone would pay for a survey he wants. They would pay for it.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the USIA pay for it?

Mr. RUSH. Radio Free Europe would pay for it.

The CHAIRMAN. They ought to get any result they like, I guess.

Mr. RUSH. That was not the purpose of them. The purpose of it was to get the truth.

The CHAIRMAN. I understand.

Mr. RUSH. Solzhenitsyn said that if one wants to know what is going on in Russia he must listen to Radio Liberty.

LICENSING PROVISIONS UNDER WHICH TRANSMITTERS OPERATE

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, Radio Free Europe has transmitters in West Germany and Portugal. Radio Liberty has transmitters in West Germany, Spain, and Taiwan.

What are the licensing provisions under which these transmitters operate?

Mr. RUSH. They are licensed by the local governments, and in the case of Germany they have licenses from the German Government.

In the case of Portugal, licenses from the Portuguese Government. In the case of Taiwan, the Republic of China Government.

The CHAIRMAN. And in Spain?

Mr. RUSH. The same thing.

PAYMENTS TO HOST GOVERNMENTS FOR LICENSES

The CHAIRMAN. How much do we pay or do the host governments receive for these licenses in each case?

Mr. RUSH. I would be glad to supply that for the record. I think I have it for Germany here.

The CHAIRMAN. We had it last year. Can't you bring it up to date? Are you increasing these fees?

Mr. RUSH. Spain, about \$270,000 annually.

The CHAIRMAN. Your assistant ought to know it; we went into this last year.

Mr. RUSH. Portugal was receiving \$70,000, but they recently agreed to virtually eliminate it. And for Germany, approximately \$20,000 a year, each.

The CHAIRMAN. We pay Germany \$20,000?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. How much to Portugal?

Mr. RUSH. Portugal, \$70,000. But they have agreed to virtually eliminate it—\$1,000 per year.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that part of the Azores Agreement in which we give them several million dollars? We just had negotiations concerning the Azores in which we have an extended license on the largest air base and we gave them a lot of long-term, low-interest money. Is that a part of that agreement?

Mr. RUSH. It is not part of the Azores Agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you sure?

Mr. RUSH. So I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. It wasn't negotiated at the same time.

Mr. RUSH. Not that I know of.

The CHAIRMAN. You really don't know whether it was or not?

Mr. RUSH. I am informed it was not part of the Azores Agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. By whom are you informed?

Mr. RUSH. By my associate, Mr. Baker here.

The CHAIRMAN. How much did Taiwan receive?

Mr. RUSH. We will supply that for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, we went all over this last year. Why don't you have these facts? Who is your associate?

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Baker.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your position?

Mr. BAKER. I am Director of the Office of Eastern European Affairs of the Department of State.

The CHAIRMAN. I thought you said there was someone here with you from Radio Free Europe.

Mr. BAKER. We can give you that information right away.

The CHAIRMAN. Bring him up. That is what these hearings are for. Sit him right there. These are very simple facts.

How much do we pay Taiwan to have a station there?

The reporter wants both of your full names.

STATEMENT OF HOWLAND SARGEANT, PRESIDENT OF THE RADIO
LIBERTY COMMITTEE

Mr. SARGEANT. I am Howland Sargeant, president of the Radio Liberty Committee.

Mr. BAKER. I am John Baker, Director, Office of Eastern European Affairs, Department of State.

Mr. RUSH. I am informed by Mr. Sargeant that we pay Taiwan \$144,000 a year in license fees.

The CHAIRMAN. In license fees? Do we pay them anything else?

Mr. SARGEANT. No, sir, that is not strictly a licensee fee. That is a rental of the transmitters that are owned by the Broadcasting Corporation of China. That is the total cost of using these transmitters for 8 hours a day, 365 days a year.

[The information referred to follows:]

DETAILED INFORMATION ON LICENSING AND RENTAL ARRANGEMENTS IN HOST COUNTRIES

[Supplied by Department of State]

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty require transmitter sites in both Germany and the Iberian peninsula in order to reach the largest possible potential audiences, to take advantage of differing propagation conditions during daytime and evening hours, and to permit use of both higher and lower frequencies in the short-wave spectrum in order to reach widely separated reception areas. RL's Taiwan transmissions are directed toward the East Asian portion of the USSR.

Both stations hold technical licenses for the operation of their transmitters from the German Federal Post Office. They are automatically renewed each year unless advance notice is given. Fees are calculated annually on the basis of the number and power of transmitters in use. For FY 1973 and RFE and RL fees have each totalled approximately \$20,000.

In Portugal, RFE broadcasts are retransmitted by a Portuguese corporation created for that purpose—RARET. Some of RARET's directors are Free Europe, Inc. executives or directors, and its operating director is an RFE engineer. Permission to broadcast rests on a contract between RARET and the Portuguese Government. In recent years this has cost \$70,000 per year. It has just been renewed for two years, with a fee of \$1,000 per year.

According to RL's most recent agreement with the Spanish government in 1971, Radio Liberty pays \$285,000 per year for use of its installations.

Radio Liberty pays an annual rental of \$144,000 for the use of transmitters in Taiwan which are owned by the Broadcasting Corporation of China.

At no time are broadcasts of either station reviewed by any official of any host government before they go on the air.

NO ADVERTISING CARRIED BY PROGRAMS

The CHAIRMAN. Do any of these programs carry advertising in any way at all, any private advertising?

Mr. RUSH. They do not carry any advertising, Mr. Chairman.

CENSORSHIP IN COUNTRIES FROM WHICH U.S. BROADCASTS

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, is there anything incongruous about the fact that here you broadcast from several countries where the censorship upon their own broadcasting is just as great as it is in Eastern Europe? Is there any more freedom to broadcast anything you like in a place like Spain or Taiwan than there is in Eastern Europe?

Mr. RUSH. I am not familiar with the broadcasting in Taiwan or in Spain, but Spain, of course, has access to the radios of all Western Europe.

The CHAIRMAN. But you make so much about the idea that we are informing the people of the truth, the freedom of transmission, and so on, but the restrictions upon free publication in the countries from which

these broadcasts originate are just as great as they are in the countries that are being propagandized.

Mr. RUSH. I would certainly not think so, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You wouldn't think so?

Mr. RUSH. No.

The CHAIRMAN. In Greece the VOA has a very large installation, I think, in Kavala. It always seemed odd to me we used Greece to transmit propaganda against dictatorships and against restrictions and repressive regimes. Does that ever strike you as being a little incongruous?

Mr. RUSH. Greece is our ally in NATO and we, of course, do not interfere with the internal affairs of our allies—or for that matter of our antagonists. What we are trying to do is to have a free flow of information about what is going on in the Western World known to the peoples of the Warsaw Pact countries and the U.S.S.R.

Now, I think the Greeks know pretty well what is going on in the Western World and I think the Taiwanese and Portuguese and Spaniards know pretty well what is going on in the Western World.

In the case of Radio Liberty, we are trying to let the Russians know what is going on in Russia, primarily.

QUESTION OF WHAT IS TRUTH

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, I don't want to burden the record. I guess I ought to resist this question of what is the truth. Last year it came out very clearly that the concept of the truth is the official statement by the U.S. Government. That constitutes the truth.

Mr. RUSH. In the case—

The CHAIRMAN. That is what we broadcast. Like Mr. Nowak, the truth to him is the way he expressed it in his letter. The fact that it is utterly erroneous doesn't seem to make any difference. He thinks it is the truth. All government organizations do it. This is not different. This is propaganda and that is its purpose. You would never have justified the radios and you couldn't today, if you go over on the floor, except implicit in it is that we are fighting the cold war. I don't think you could sell the American people the idea that we should pay \$50 million simply to entertain people.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chairman, I do not consider—

The CHAIRMAN. I don't believe you could do it. You don't mean it when you say we are giving them the truth and good entertainment. What you mean is that we are trying to influence them to follow our position, our policies. That has always been true and still is. I don't know why you have to deny that.

Mr. RUSH. I have no apology to make for saying that our policies should be well known to everyone around the world. At the same time the purpose of these stations is not to say what our policy is. Over 50 percent of their entire broadcasting is devoted to telling them what is going on in their own countries, or to paraphrase Solzhenitsyn: If one wants to know what is going on in Russia you have to hear Radio Liberty because you can't get it in Russia itself.

We have been able also to read publications in Russian so they can be reported back in the U.S.S.R. and be spread around when they can't be published there without being censored. We are trying to spread information based on what we think is the right to know the truth. As

you say, what the truth is—is a matter of judgment, perhaps, but certainly we tell the facts—Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe tell the facts as they see them and get them from those countries; and East Europe has 30 million people listening, as we are told by independent organizations.

The CHAIRMAN. One passage in the report of the Presidential study is an illustration, I think, of what I mean. This is a quote on page 30.

It says,

Radio Liberty has given all of the facts. Its analyses, based on careful research, have shown the vastness of the Soviet commitment of resources to the Arab states at a time when these resources are badly needed at home and have shown that this aid was not contributing to a peaceful solution of the Arab-Israel conflict.

It seems to me that there is certain irony in that, in that version of the truth. It seems to me exactly the same message in reverse could be delivered with equal accuracy to the American people.

Mr. RUSH. The American people were fully informed as to what we were doing in supplying aid to Israel, and they also were informed as to what the Russians were doing to the extent we found out—supplying aid to the Egyptians or other Arabs.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me this is simply the interpretation of our own view, that it doesn't contribute to a peaceful solution and is depriving the people in Russia of money for their bread and clothing.

LEGAL OBLIGATIONS IF RADIOS ARE PHASED OUT

One last thing. In the Commission study it states that if the radios were to be phased out today they would face legal obligations of more than \$80 million.

I wonder if you could explain why they would be faced with \$80 million.

Mr. RUSH. Yes, I will be very pleased, Mr. Chairman.

This would cover, of course, severance pay. The stations have stringent legal obligations under the law in the countries which they operate in.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. RUSH. The stations have stringent legal obligations under the laws in the countries in which they operate, encompassing severance pay, pension pay—things of this type, payable to personnel.

The CHAIRMAN. In Germany we have to abide by the laws of Germany?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. About severance pay?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Pensions?

Mr. RUSH. Pensions and the like. These may be contractual obligations or they may be legal obligations or they may be both.

[The following information was subsequently supplied:]

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON LIQUIDATION COSTS OF RADIOS

[Supplied by Department of State]

The report of the Commission on International Broadcasting includes the following statement (on page 53) concerning the liquidation of RFE and RL:

"There is . . . another major potential expense to be taken into consideration. These are the liquidation costs for the two stations if the day comes when

conditions in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe change to such a degree as to permit a free interplay of information there and, consequently, the phasing out of RFE and RL.

"The stations have stringent legal obligations under the laws of the countries in which they operate encompassing severance pay, pension payments, etc. These obligations, if confronted today, are estimated by the stations to be more than \$80 million.

"Since their inception the stations have been funded largely by United States appropriated funds. We are convinced, therefore, that it is a moral obligation of the highest order for the United States Government to accept responsibility for the liquidation costs accruing to the stations. Although this contingency may not occur in the near future, the Commission feels strongly that such an obligation should be recognized and acknowledged now in the interests of the morale of the stations' employees and reassurance to the host governments."

The following passage was contained in the *Report to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the United States Senate: U.S. Government Monies Provided to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty*, submitted by the Comptroller General of the United States on May 25, 1972:

"The estimated liquidation costs for these organizations (RFE and RL) range from \$44.1 million to \$81.3 million. The details of these cost estimates are set forth below.

"*Free Europe.*—Free Europe estimated that it would cost between \$31.4 million and \$59.8 million to liquidate its activities. These estimates were prepared on February 29, 1972. Free Europe liquidation costs are divided into 3 categories.

"*Mandatory costs (\$31.4 million).*—These are costs that will be required because of law, union or other contracts, and Free Europe policy. These costs include termination payments to employees, nonpersonal liquidation costs (i.e., disposal of leases, contracts, assets, and records), and phaseout and liquidation staff costs.

"*Voluntary costs (\$81.4 million).*—These are costs that Free Europe considered to be voluntary or moral obligations. These included continuing obligations (pensions and insurances) and special resettlement or employment assistance to persons whose employment was terminated.

"*Unknown costs (\$10 million).*—These are contingency costs which, Free Europe believes, could arise from additional termination costs and costs resulting from delays, arbitration or labor court decision, and special settlements.

"Free Europe estimates that most of the liquidation could be accomplished in 1 year and that it could be completed in 1 more year.

"*Radio Liberty Committee.*—On March 6, 1972, RLC estimated that it would cost between \$12.7 million and \$21.5 million to liquidate its operations. RLC's major cost categories are:

"*Mandatory costs (\$12.7 million).*—These will be the costs that will be required to be incurred under either contractual agreements or general practice. These include costs for employment termination, employee moving, lease terminations, and administrative matters.

"*Voluntary costs (\$7.7 million).*—These are costs which are not required under contractual agreement but which RLC considered desirable. These include unfunded past service costs of pension plans and post-termination assistance.

"*Indefinite and unknown costs (\$1.1 million).*—These are not covered by agreements, but RLC believes that these costs conceivably could arise. These include restoration of grounds in Taiwan, loss of assets, and a contingency reserve for litigation costs."

The Conference Report (92-914) on S. 18, Grants to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, contained the following statement:

"... the Conferees were agreed that should there be a decision to terminate the activities of the radios, fairness and equity require that funds would need to be made available for orderly termination. They also agreed that this reference to termination is not to be construed as a prejudgment as to continuation of the programs, their expansion, their contraction, or other means of financing the Radios."

The CHAIRMAN. You remind me of Chancellor Brandt's visit here. He was our guest. I asked him why he didn't pay for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty if he liked it. Maybe I shouldn't quote him. But the effect of what he said was that he could live without it.

Mr. RUSH. Yes. But, Mr. Chairman, the radios have union contracts. They would not want to leave a country and not live up to agreements made with the unions, for example.

WAS GERMAN GOVERNMENT ASKED TO TAKE OVER RADIOS ?

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever asked the German Government if they would be willing to take over these radios and operate them ?

Mr. RUSH. We have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you think it would have been reasonable, in view of the discussion last year, that you should ask them ?

I thought Senator Percy's statement last year indicated he thought we should be interested at least in exploring this.

Senator PERCY. I don't think we ever put the question or asked the State Department to put the question of taking them over. The question was would they share in the cost. As I understand it, some progress is being made in that, some degree of willingness to share in the research costs, but there has not been much progress made in sharing operating expenses, and some question was raised by the Commission as to whether this would be really desirable, whether it would require a whole board of directors to decide operational questions as to programming, for example.

WAS GERMAN GOVERNMENT ASKED TO SHARE COSTS ?

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever ask the German Government if they would contribute or share the cost ?

Mr. RUSH. It would have been very premature for us to ask the German Government to do so when we had not as yet received the report of the Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. No, I thought in light of this committee's hearing last year, and especially the expressions of the Senator from Illinois and others concerning this—you mean you took no notice of that and did not inquire whether they would pay anything ?

Mr. RUSH. The President appointed a very distinguished Commission to look into that subject and into the entire subject of how and whether the radios should be operated. That Commission has now reported, and the President transmitted the report on May 7 to Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. It is clear that you ignored anything the committee said and you relied on your own appointees' report. Is that not correct ?

Mr. RUSH. No, that is not correct.

LICENSE FEE PAYMENTS TO GERMANS

The CHAIRMAN. Did you do anything ? We not only don't get the Germans to help pay for it, we pay them for the privilege of having the radios there. You just stated it. We pay them \$20,000 a year, is that right ?

Mr. RUSH. \$20,000 from each radio in license fees to the Germans, yes. And the Germans—

The CHAIRMAN. Is that new dollars or old dollars ? Do we have to pay more now or is it still \$20,000 depreciated dollars. Is it marks or dollars ?

Mr. RUSH. That was the dollar cost in the last year's budget.

The CHAIRMAN. What will it be in this coming year? Do you have to adjust for the devaluation?

Mr. RUSH. We have, I think, a very sympathetic listener and very sympathetic helper in the German Government.

PAYING FOR RADIO OBJECTED TO

The CHAIRMAN. As long as you pay them. I would be sympathetic, too, if you were paying me. I don't object to the operation, but I object to paying for it. I object that my constituents have to pay for this kind of operation under present conditions.

Mr. RUSH. I am sure \$20,000 is not a major consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. Not for you all, but it is for me and my constituents. I know you don't think anything of it.

Mr. RUSH. What I was going to say was that I am sure \$20,000 is not a major consideration with regard to the German Government's decision as to whether or not—

The CHAIRMAN. It is the principle of the thing that irritates me. The Germans are much better off than we are, relatively speaking. Their mark has appreciated 20 percent against the dollar in the last year.

Mr. RUSH. It has appreciated very substantially.

The CHAIRMAN. We look so silly, we look so utterly stupid to continue these operations. This is why the dollar continues to be weak. Nobody has any confidence in the Government in this country curing our ailments. One of them is the weakness of our currency and weakness of our balance of payments. Eighty percent, I believe you said, of this money is used abroad to buy foreign currency. I believe you stated that, did you not?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So that in effect, say, 80 percent is a direct charge on our balance of payments, is it not?

Mr. RUSH. It is. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Aiken, do you have any words of wisdom?

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me you take these personal attacks on yourself too seriously. I think you should be more grateful because if they affect you next year as they affected Senator Case last year, you should be elected by a landslide.

Also, I admit they are irritating at times. I recently became disillusioned—

The CHAIRMAN. I only object to paying for it. I get lots of letters like this, but I don't normally pay for them.

Senator AIKEN. I think you should report it as a campaign contribution.

DISILLUSIONMENT WITH MEDIA

I have recently been disillusioned to the extent I hardly believe anything that I see or read or hear anymore. Only yesterday morning I read in the Washington Post that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy was having an executive meeting at 9 o'clock yesterday morning to write up the authorization bill for the AEC for the coming year. Now, that didn't make sense to me because I have never known a quorum of that committee to be on hand at 10 o'clock, to say nothing of

9 o'clock. Nevertheless, there was a notice right in the newspaper, which admittedly prints nothing but the truth, particularly as it affects the White House or the Watergate or some of those items. So I went to the committee room at 9 o'clock. When I got there, I was the only one there, and it turns out that I had gone to the right place at the right time of day, but on the wrong day. The 9 o'clock meeting was the week before the time indicated by Washington's famous newspaper. Well, that is that.

BROADCASTING TO TAIWAN AND CHINA

Do you broadcast all the news relative to our relations with China throughout Taiwan?

Mr. RUSH. The radios don't broadcast to audiences in Taiwan, Senator Aiken.

Senator AIKEN. You don't broadcast?

Mr. RUSH. We do not broadcast to audiences in Taiwan.

Senator AIKEN. You don't? Why not? I think they would be the people to whom you ought.

Mr. RUSH. It is beamed toward the U.S.S.R. It is beamed really for the Far East of the Soviet Union from Taiwan.

Senator AIKEN. Do we broadcast in China all of the developing relations with Russia, that part of China which we cover, I mean?

Mr. RUSH. The Voice of America would do that.

Senator AIKEN. They would? Do they?

Mr. RUSH. The Voice of America would, yes.

Senator AIKEN. It seems to me that they should.

SUGGESTED LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR STATIONS

I notice that in the report of the President's Commission they say that a plan for the stations should be of a long-range nature. They also say we can expect little sharing of the burden from any other country.

Does that mean we should plan to continue these broadcasting stations for the indefinite future and pay the costs ourselves?

Mr. RUSH. We feel, Mr. Chairman, that as long as the peoples of the U.S.S.R. and of the other Warsaw Pact countries do not have access to information—true, accurate information on what is going on within their own countries, as well as what is going on abroad, that they are entitled to know—then we should continue the stations.

We feel that these stations are very important contributors to bringing about détente, as I mentioned in my statement, and one of our major foreign policy objectives is to supply people with accurate information, especially as it comes from our free press.

Now, we do plan, as I mentioned, to get support from other governments and from private sources in Europe. However, we feel governmental support should be restricted to research because, if we should have other governments support the operations of the stations, then they would probably also have to participate in the management of the stations. We would then get involved with all of the complexities of multinational operation of the stations, which the Commission thinks and which I also think would pretty well nullify their ability to operate as they should; namely, to transmit to these countries information about what is going on within these countries without getting political considerations between nations involved in it.

TAX DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Senator AIKEN. Do you think that if the countries of Western Europe and West Germany, in particular, gave tax deductions for contributions to this cause that we would then get any contributions?

Mr. RUSH. We think we will get some contributions; and this committee that I mentioned—the Western European Advisory Committee on the Free Flow of Information, it is called—does plan to work to get contributions from private sources and foundations for this.

Senator AIKEN. Will it be tax deductible?

Mr. RUSH. I think it may be. It depends on the laws of the country.

Senator AIKEN. Here or there? Will it be from branches of American industries?

Mr. RUSH. That committee would work only in Europe, Senator Aiken. The contributions here would be tax deductible under our laws; and to the degree that tax deductions are allowed in other countries, they would be sought there too.

Senator AIKEN. The contributions from an American branch industry located in Europe would be deductible under our laws?

Mr. RUSH. Would be deductible under their laws. In other words, if you had a German subsidiary of an American company, it files its tax return in Germany and it might be able to deduct from its tax return filed in Germany under German law a contribution made to Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty.

Senator AIKEN. Under German law?

Mr. RUSH. Under German law.

Senator AIKEN. Is it deductible under German laws?

Mr. RUSH. I believe it might be.

Senator AIKEN. It wasn't last year when we had the hearing. That was one reason they gave for getting no contributions from Western Europe.

Mr. RUSH. Of course, the tax laws in these countries differ. In the new legislation that is being established, we hope to set it up in a way that we will get tax-deductible contributions where the law allows it.

I am not sufficiently familiar with the tax laws of Europe to know.

Senator AIKEN. I am not either. All I knew is what I was told, very little in the nature of charitable contributions. This would be charitable or deductible in Western Europe. Maybe we need to look into that too.

RADIOS NOT VIEWED AS BARGAINING CHIP WITH RUSSIANS

Have you viewed these radios in any sense as a bargaining chip with the Russians?

Mr. RUSH. No, we do not.

Senator AIKEN. They simply broadcast facts.

Mr. RUSH. That is right.

Senator AIKEN. I think that is all I have now.

I still think you should report your campaign contribution.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Percy.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Secretary, is Mr. Durkee in the room?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir, he is.

Senator PERCY. I wonder if he could join us at the table.

WAYS RADIOS PERFORM IN WHICH VOICE OF AMERICA CANNOT

I have just a few general questions that might be helpful to those of our colleagues who are not here now but will study the record, and the first pertains to the ways the two radios perform in support of U.S. foreign policy, ways in which the Voice of America cannot perform. The question frequently is raised, why can't VOA do the whole job? Why do we need Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe? I will understand if you feel that any question would be more appropriately answered by either Mr. Sargeant, Mr. Baker, or Mr. Durkee.

Mr. RUSH. Well, the radios, Senator Percy, are not spokesmen for American official policy. The Voice of America is the spokesman for American official policy. These radios are really, as President Nixon has said, "expressions of our profound conviction that a responsible, independent, and free press plays an indispensable part in the social and political processes that look to better understanding and more effective cooperation, not only within a nation, but also among nations."

Now, Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty spend over half of their broadcast time telling the countries involved what is happening behind the Iron Curtain. We feel that the right to know—as the Commission expresses it, the free flow of information—is an essential part of our foreign policy.

For example, a major factor in our foreign policy is to have free emigration; for example, of Jews from the Soviet Union. In part, broadcasting petitions of Jewish activists—Radio Liberty broadcasts those back to the U.S.S.R.—we have been able, I think, to have very material success in having the Soviet Government ease those restrictions; for, as you know, the emigration tax now is being waived. Most of the people of the U.S.S.R. didn't know about the emigration tax for many months, but they found out about it from Radio Liberty; and once they found out about it, you had both internal and external pressures to relax that tax.

The same thing can be said, for example, of the Soviet withdrawal from Egypt. By our letting the people of the U.S.S.R. know what really happened, they realized that there was a schism between the U.S.S.R. and Egypt, which had an effect upon the operations of the Soviet Government. So that I would say that the radios help our foreign policy in the sense that the people of the Warsaw Pact countries, knowing the truth, knowing what is going on, help negate the spread of propaganda that could create ill will and allow the Soviet Government to carry on with impunity policies that are not conducive to détente and not conducive to a better world. But it is only in the sense that knowledge is acquired of the true facts that this does help our foreign policy. But that is a very important point.

RADIOS' EFFECT ON DÉTENTE

Senator PERCY. The President has clearly enunciated the policy that we seek an era of negotiation rather than confrontation. If you will excuse the expression, doesn't the existence of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty bug the Soviet Union? Doesn't it bother them? Critics of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have said the broadcasts are destructive and present an obstacle to détente.

How would you answer that question?

Mr. RUSH. Well, I would first say, Senator Percy, that the facts show that with Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe operating, we are in an age of détente with the Soviets. Now what brought the Soviets around to wanting to have an era of détente? Part of it, of course, is popular approval of détente and popular pressure for it. I feel that the broadcasts of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe through the years have allowed many of the people of the U.S.S.R. and many of the Warsaw Pact countries to know more of what is happening in our world—in the free world—and to know more about what is really happening in the Soviet Union and the other Warsaw Pact countries; so that they are much more receptive, I think due to both of these radios, to an era of détente. In fact, pressure from them, I think, has been a factor in bringing about détente. Obviously the Soviet Government and the other Warsaw Pact governments are not in favor of the radios or they would distribute this information themselves. They, however, realize what they themselves are doing. They are spreading propaganda in our world on a very heavy basis. They realize that what we are really doing is spreading the facts of what is happening in their countries to peoples who can't otherwise get it. They oppose it, but they can't stop it.

RESPONSIVENESS OF COMMUNIST GOVERNMENTS TO PUBLIC OPINION

Senator PERCY. I think there is an impression in this country that Communist governments are not responsive to public opinion, that they are not moved by the changing moods and feelings of people in their countries.

I wonder if we could have a statement either by you or Mr. Baker as to whether that is true or not, whether Communist governments can stay totally removed from public opinion, or whether movements in public opinion in Communist countries actually do exert an influence or a pressure on those governments, to which they must respond.

Mr. RUSH. I think there is no doubt, Senator Percy, that the leaders of the U.S.S.R. and of other closed societies do not operate in a vacuum. They must carry their people with them and they must respond to pressures. I think, for example, economic pressure was a very important factor in the overthrow of Khrushchev—economic and political pressures, and we do find in closed societies that they have very serious upheavals. Poland had one a short while back—just 2 years ago, and one thing that was of great assistance in bringing about better working conditions there was the broadcasts by Radio Free Europe to the Polish people of what the shipyard workers were doing. So I think one can say very clearly that a government must respond to public opinion; otherwise, they wouldn't try to control public opinion as they do.

The whole purpose of preventing the dissemination of any information except what they want disseminated is to control the people and have public opinion back the government.

So I would say public opinion certainly influences Communist governments just as it does in any other form of society.

POSSIBILITY OF GETTING OTHER NATIONS TO CONTRIBUTE TO BUDGETARY COSTS

Senator PERCY. On a very valid point that the Chairman has made on balance-of-payments costs to us, we can't say we can't afford to do things when we compare the size of our economy, a trillion, three or four hundred billion against that of other countries. Yet balance of paymentswise we are in a deficit position and hurting.

My point on NATO defense costs through the years, ever since I have been in the Senate, 61½ years, has been that no country should lose or gain balance of payments wise as a result of expenditures for the common defense. Now this broadcast activity is carried on in the common interest, our allies are sympathetic to it. I think it would dismay many of them if we dismantled these stations.

The broadcasts are also for the common defense in a way, without weapons. When you consider weapons costs, the broadcasts cost less than five or ten fighter planes. Yet we seem to order the planes without hesitation. But a \$50 million cost that is not a military expenditure is subject to a great deal of scrutiny. It took years for us to get the German Government to find ways to pick up some budgetary defense costs. Do you think we can have more progress in this area?

Mr. RUSH. The two to me, Senator Percy, are very different. The magnitude is very different. Our balance-of-payments cost in NATO is about a billion seven hundred million dollars a year now. Our balance-of-payments cost of these radios, as we go forward, is about \$40 million, less what we may raise in Europe, which might be as high as \$4 million. I think basically the big question here is how we can most effectively operate the radios. As the Commission has said, if we have multinational operation of these radios, there is a grave danger that they won't be effective at all. For example, in NATO we wanted to have exercises—naval exercises—in the Mediterranean recently, and we were unable to stop at one port because one nation in NATO didn't want us to stop in that particular port. There are many issues in NATO like this that arise all the time where one nation can prevent something from being done.

In the operation of these radios you would have any one contributing nation saying, we don't want to do this because of our present position. I think you would nullify the effectiveness of the radios. You can have differences of opinion in a country as to the radios, as we have seen on your committee this morning.

Now, I could well imagine, for example, in Germany the question of what we should do might be a highly partisan thing. This could effect the day-to-day operations of the radios. The really nonpartisan operations, as we now have and envision continuing—where in large measure what the radios are doing is telling the Russian and other peoples in the U.S.S.R. what is happening there and telling the other Warsaw Pact peoples what is happening in those countries—might well be changed. These other countries might think they have certain objectives they wished to push since they were paying for it.

So while I think it is perfectly proper for us to attempt to seek funds from other governments for research, as the Commission has recommended—in part because they can use the research, I do not think it would be wise to have other nations pay for operations and thereby be entitled to a voice in operating these radios.

COVERAGE OF BRANDT TRIP TO ISRAEL

Senator PERCY. I would like to conclude by trying to be specific about certain ways things are handled, to be as sure as I can be that what we are doing is in accord with American foreign policy. Let us take the visit of Willy Brandt to Israel. What would be the policy in reporting that trip on Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and, from your experience, how would the trip be reported by official radios in Poland, for example? Do you have any idea? And if you don't, I would like the Chairman to hold the record open for an insertion on the coverage of the Brandt trip by the radios I have mentioned.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM DURKEE, PRESIDENT, RADIO FREE EUROPE

Mr. DURKEE. I don't need to guess about what Radio Free Europe would be doing. We would be reporting it as it is reported by the world press. We would be doing that every hour to all countries to which we broadcast. What they would be broadcasting in their turn I couldn't tell you. On some occasions they would report it fully.

Senator PERCY. This ought to mean something to Poland, for instance, and the millions of people there. From past experience would Radio Warsaw be as current as you?

Mr. DURKEE. No, they would neither be as current nor rapid nor as full and they would be likely in this case to play down that story, I would judge.

[The information referred to follows:]

COVERAGE OF CHANCELLOR BRANDT'S VISIT TO ISRAEL BY SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN MEDIA, AND BY RADIO LIBERTY AND RADIO FREE EUROPE

[Supplied by the Department of State]

In East Europe and the Soviet Union, the fact of Chancellor Brandt's visit to Israel was registered, and little more. His arrival and departure were reported, and Polish, Hungarian and Czechoslovak media noted some of his day-by-day activities, but his statements were scarcely mentioned, and the significance of the trip as a symbol of reconciliation was ignored.

In the Soviet Union, a citizen who had to rely on Soviet media coverage alone for reports on the Brandt visit would have remained essentially ignorant. The total coverage by *Pravda* consisted of the following items:

Issue of June 7:

VISIT IN TEL AVIV

The Federal Chancellor of FRG Willy Brandt arrived today in Tel Aviv for an official visit.

Issue on June 12:

NOT IN THE ROLE OF MEDIATOR

The official visit of the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany Willy Brandt to Israel came to an end today.

In a statement made during the visit, W. Brandt expressed once again the opinion that the Federal Republic of Germany cannot act in the role of a mediator in the Near East conflict. However, the Chancellor noted, the unsettled Near East conflict is also a problem to the Federal Republic, for it is unlikely that Europe can have a guaranteed peace if a peaceful settlement in the Near East is not worked out.

Czechoslovak media confined themselves to comings and goings with one addition: Brandt's statement that good West German relations with Israel would not be at the expense of the Arab states. Radio Sofia carried the word that the Chancellor had said that a reduction of tensions in Europe must be accompanied

by a similar process in the Middle East. It was Radio Sofia also which carried the one editorial comment: it interpreted the visit as an Israeli attempt to break out of the isolation caused by its own "militarism and arrogant disregard for international legal and moral standards."

The difficulty Soviet media—and therefore East European radio as well had in covering this story can be explained by the switch in the Soviet propaganda line since Chancellor Brandt initiated his Ostpolitik, as well as by the obvious problems of Soviet-Israeli relations and the Soviet Jewish question. Only in the last two years have Soviet media turned from indiscriminate condemnation of Bonn's policies as being dominated by the interests of "militarists" and "revanchists", to admitting the existence of a "realistic" attitude in Bonn. Meanwhile, the Soviet Government continues to follow a policy of keeping its people concerned about the possibility of a repetition of the World War II disasters, through newsreels, plays, novels, and audio-visual permanent exhibits at such monuments as that to the fallen people of Stalingrad. As recently as October 1972 the leaders of the CDU were described as being surrounded by "most of the reactionary and militarist elements." Even in the SPT, *Pravda* in November 1972 insisted that a contradiction existed between the party's political line and their practical activities, despite "the realistic approach of its leadership to many problems."

Radio Liberty's coverage of Chancellor Brandt's visit to Israel consisted of regular daily news reports, reviews of the world press concentrating primarily on European reports, and news feature backgrounders. In the course of eight days, RL broadcast 20 news items, four background programs, and four press reviews.

To offset the inadequacy of East European reporting, RFE reported on the visit day to day: it noted the significance of the visit as the first by a German leader to Israel, and as evidence of the good relations between the two countries. RFE emphasized that the visit was exclusively concerned with bilateral relations between Israel and the FRG, and was not an attempt by Bonn to influence Mideast affairs. Coverage included taped statements by Premier Golda Maier and Chancellor Brandt. Over a nine-day period, the five RFE services broadcast an average of 10 programs each, other than newscasts, on the subject.

Both radios made use of press reviews to underline the significance of the visit, quoting from editorials of German, Israeli, American, British, French, Swiss and Egyptian papers.

PRESSURE EXERTED ON OFFICIAL RADIO OF POLAND

Senator PERCY. Do you think that by your reporting accurately and fully as it comes across the wire services, beaming it in there, that you are exerting a certain amount of pressure on the official radio of Poland to catch up somehow, and are you raising questions in the minds of Poles as to why they can't get full information of their own nation's radio broadcasts?

Mr. DURKEE. What you draw is an analogy in each one of the countries in which we broadcast, and I can document this for the records. They have changed the character of their news broadcasts, the character of their radio programs. They use names of radio programs that approximate use in order to defeat the public. They have changed their whole technique as a result of our broadcasting.

[The information referred to follows:]

STIMULATION OF EAST EUROPEAN AND SOVIET NEWS MEDIA BY RFE AND RL

[Supplied by the Department of State]

While not exemplified by the case of the visit to Israel, there is considerable evidence that rapid and detailed coverage of major domestic and international events by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty—as well as other programming which attracts Eastern listeners—has caused concern and efforts at counteraction by media and party leaderships.

Attention is called to the statement elsewhere in this record on "Soviet and East European Media Treatment of U.S. Space Achievements." In addition, East

European Party and government publications and officials have regularly stressed the need for their own press and radio to provide fuller and more prompt information on internal and external developments, if they are to persuade their populations not to listen to RFE and other Western broadcasters.

As far back as July 1965 the Hungarian Party house organ for activists, *Partelet*, admitted:

"We have to consider the fact that if we fail to keep the public adequately informed, the audience of the hostile Hungarian radio station will grow . . . If we fail to talk about something, the enemy will do so, and thus reticence will mean a political defeat . . ."

Bulgaria's radio system has been engaged since early 1971 in efforts to modernize its news and other techniques, with new programs to appeal to youth, more foreign news, and more variety in its programming. RFE in 1970 initiated a series of programs on problems of the decades ahead, such as the subordination of technology to human needs, cybernetics, pollution and overpopulation, and sociological problems, made up of interviews with internationally recognized experts such as Arnold Tonymbee. In January 1971 Radio Sofia introduced a series called "The World of the Seventies" in a nearly identical format, but employing prominent speakers from the Communist world.

In Czechoslovakia, Radio Hvezda, a nationwide state-operated network, shifted to round-the-clock broadcasting on January 1, 1973, featuring regular news programs and information items interspersed with music. The Director General of Czechoslovakian Radio stated frankly that the new format would fill gaps in the schedule, so that listeners would not have to "depend on foreign stations" in off-hours.

As described in the report of the Presidential Study Commission, RFE's reporting of suppressed information about the Polish coastal disturbances prompted the new Polish leadership to provide better information to the public. Three months later, in March 1971, the youth publication *Student* commented:

"If the mass information media could have given full and unbiased information, and could have been more frank, perhaps the (riots) might not have reached such tragic proportions. Any limitation on (reporting) should never be extended to facts. For these facts, if they are withheld by the censor, will reach us anyway—either in the form of rumor or through the news and information broadcasts of Radio Free Europe."

In the Soviet Union, an article in the magazine aimed at official propagandists, *Agitator* (September, 1970), delivered left-handed compliments to Western broadcasters for their scoops of the Soviet media with news. The way to overcome this, the article stated, is "by perfecting the information work of our own sources. Saturation via the press, via radio and television broadcasts, and by the verbal propagation of high quantity, operative information therefore represents . . . a very vital part of our struggle against our ideological broadcasting opponent."

DOES MAKING INFORMATION AVAILABLE FURTHER U.S. FOREIGN POLICY?

Senator PERCY. Secretary Rush, do you feel that making available such information furthers the foreign policy of the United States?

Mr. RUSH. I think, Senator Percy, that a free flow of information furthers the foreign policy of our country and should be one of the main objectives of the foreign policy of our country. That is the purpose of these radios.

SOVIET ANTI-GERMAN PROPAGANDA

Senator PERCY. From your own experience, have you felt it has been a matter of policy in the Soviet Union to keep anti-German feeling alive in the Soviet Union itself? I was struck when I was in Moscow by the elaborate exhibits of Nazism to keep that feeling alive and to justify many activities and actions and deprivations and sacrifices asked of the Soviet people by their government.

Mr. RUSH. I think this was a factor of great importance to them in their own policy and also a very cohesive factor in holding together the Warsaw Pact bloc.

Senator PERCY. Would it be possible for the people in the Soviet Union to know, for instance, as was reported yesterday, that Willy Brandt stated that now 25 years later attitudes have changed and there is revulsion inside Germany itself against the excesses of Nazism—and half the present population of Germany was not even born then—that those facts would be important in helping to offset the anti-German propaganda from the Soviet Government over such a long period?

Mr. RUSH. I think that is a very important factor.

SOVIET REPORTING CONCERNING U.S. SPACE ACTIVITIES

Senator PERCY. How much attention do you think the official broadcasts of the Soviet Union would be giving about U.S. activities in space. In the past week we have seen a remarkable demonstration of what man can do in space. Is it important that we get across to the millions of people in Eastern Europe and Soviet Union what we are accomplishing in space exploration? How much was reported to the Soviet people of the first landing on the moon by an American astronaut?

Mr. RUSH. Well, I think that is a very good illustration of the purpose that these radios serve. If it had not been for VOA and Radio Liberty, very little, if anything, would have been told about our first astronauts on the moon, but they couldn't keep it from their people. However, they did not tell nearly as much as they are telling about our space station. I think one reason for that is that as the people of the Soviet Union are informed through Radio Liberty, for example, of our technical progress, of our advances in science, this makes them more and more want to know our people better. It is a major factor in working toward détente. It makes détente more attractive to them and, thus, to their government. In turn, as we go into détente, the Soviets themselves then tell their people more and more about us because the cold war is not on. They will tell them about what we are now doing in space where, otherwise, they wouldn't. So, to my way of thinking, it is a progressive thing; Radio Liberty has been an important factor in conditioning the people of the U.S.S.R. to understand and want détente—to accept it, and to bring pressure on their government to get it.

In turn, as we go forward into détente, the Soviets themselves must tell more and more to their people because of the factors we just mentioned.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Durkee or Mr. Sargeant, can you actually tell us how much the Soviet people were informed about the first landing on the moon? Do you recall whether it was actually broadcast by Soviet radio?

Mr. SARGEANT. Very little, Senator Percy, was broadcast by them and it was broadcast late and pretty much under the compulsion of Western radios bringing that story to the Soviet citizen. And had it not been for that I think they would have reported only a short news item.

[The information referred to follows:]

SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN MEDIA TREATMENT OF U.S. SPACE ACHIEVEMENTS

[Supplied by the Department of State]

Soviet media reporting on the first U.S. moon landing, by Apollo 11 on July 20, 1969, is an excellent example of the way in which Western news coverage has forced the Soviet leadership to provide their own people with more information—but also of the limitations still imposed. The Soviet media actually reported the July 16 Apollo 11 launching to its people promptly, although briefly, while maintaining silence for the third consecutive day on its own less spectacular unmanned Luna 15 mission, which was also heading for the moon.

Four hours after the Apollo launching, the main Soviet evening television news show gave an extended account of the moonshot and showed about five minutes of the tape of the lift-off from Cape Kennedy. Taped segments were broadcast on Soviet TV at other points during the flight. The initial account of the mission given by TASS concluded with biographies of the three astronauts, whom TASS called "these brave men."

The first easing in Soviet reporting policy had taken place earlier, during the mission, of Soyuz 4 and 5 in January of the same year, when scenes of the liftoff were telecast within 90 minutes of the event. The relaxation was attributed at that time to Western publicity on the Apollo 8 mission around the moon. Although the televised sequences in the Soviet Union still are miniscule and delayed compared to the U.S. coverage, it is clear that U.S. coverage of its own space trips and live Western radio reporting has spurred the Soviets toward greater publicity. Errors or accidents in their own space program, however, still receive little or no detailed coverage, as shown by Soviet handling of the Soyuz mission shortly before the U.S. Skylab went into orbit this year.

In East European media, the Apollo 11 liftoff and subsequent moon landing were recognized and reported as scientific and technological feats. Reporting of the liftoff varied in its promptness and scope. However, coverage of the moon landing itself was uniformly prompt, extensive, and factual. Less favorable comments were reserved for later commentaries.

On the day of the liftoff, Radios Budapest, Prague, and Warsaw interrupted their regular programs to announce the liftoff, while others reported the event in their regular newscasts. Czechoslovak and Romanian TV networks telecast live both the liftoff and moon landing, with Hungarian TV also carrying the latter. Polish and Bulgarian TV showed video-tapes, repeated several times, of both the liftoff and landing. East European newspapers carried news reports on their front pages, especially after the landing on the moon.

As excitement over the achievement wore off, East European media began to offer comments indirectly detracting from it. A Polish paper was concerned that the feat might be "pregnant with a new threat of easy blackmail." Another warned against utilization of the moon for military purposes, and deprecated Werner von Braun as having worked for Hitler. *Radio Warsaw* pointed to the "horrible paradox" in the precautions taken by U.S. astronauts to prevent contamination of the moon by earth organisms—precautions taken by a country "which is the most advanced in the world in research concerning chemical and bacteriological arms." Hungarian media used the occasion to point to the size of U.S. expenditures for military purposes. *Radio Prague* remarked that the U.S. could afford to spend \$4 billion a year on space programs since this constituted only "five percent of the U.S. military budget." Other media, notably Bulgarian and Czechoslovak, emphasized Soviet space achievements. Despite such offsets, however, East European media gave credit to the achievement, and stressed hope that it would serve peaceful purposes on earth.

Because of the great importance of the story, RFE and Radio Liberty took advantage of their long broadcast hours to provide full coverage of the takeoff and landing, and extensive coverage of the whole mission. For example, over a 24-hour period beginning just after the landing, RFE's Romanian service broadcast nearly 5 hours of varied material, including a selection of West European editorial comment as well as positive comments by two Czechoslovak newspapers. RFE Romanian broadcasters called attention to the comprehensive and fair coverage being given the event by Romania's own media and expressed the hope it would continue.

While it is too soon to evaluate Soviet and East European coverage of the U.S. Skylab mission, it has not been extensive. Meanwhile, coverage by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty from May 23 through June 22 gave heavy emphasis to straight reporting and scientific-technical background, which made clear the

achievements of the mission with a minimum of comment. The broadcasts have dealt mainly with day-to-day developments; a number of reportages demonstrated the astronauts' resourcefulness in performing difficult tasks and making the project a success in the face of initial setbacks, and the dangers involved. There have been interviews with experts concerning the mission, and reviews of press comment on it.

SOVIET REPORTING CONCERNING EGYPT'S EXPULSION OF SOVIET MILITARY FORCES

Senator PERCY. I would like to ask also about the Middle East. We feel that it is in the best interests of people all over the world to know what is happening in the Middle East. How much reporting was done in the Soviet Union when Egypt expelled the Soviet military forces?

Mr. SARGEANT. There was very little reporting done for one reason. In the Soviet Union if there is a fast breaking news event, it can't be reported by their own media until a policy has been established. You have to make an ideological cloak that will fit the general policies. Therefore, no announcement at all was made of the return of Soviet military and other advisers, as I recall it, for a period of at least 48 hours, and at that point the report was that their mission had been completed and that, in accordance with normal procedures, they were making a return to the Soviet Union.

SOVIET PEOPLE'S ACCEPTANCE OF SOVIET AND RL BROADCASTS

Senator PERCY. So the Soviet people were blatantly lied to by their own state radio. There must be innumerable occasions when a Soviet citizen says he has heard the real story on Radio Liberty. Do we have any information as to whether they accept their Soviet broadcasts as the truth or whether they accept Radio Liberty broadcasts as the truth?

Mr. SARGENT. Well, I would say that there is a willing suspension of belief in any Soviet media by any Soviet citizen. He has learned that he cannot trust the media. He may not always trust the media of foreign countries, whether it be Radio Liberty or someone else, but it causes him to stop, to think and to ask exactly the kind of question—under circumstances where he thinks it is safe to do so—that you pose. This, in turn, exercises a pressure on Soviet media to become more honest with their own citizens.

COMPARATIVE HANDLING OF HUNGARIAN AND POLISH UPRISINGS

Senator PERCY. Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe heavily concentrate on what is happening inside Communist countries. Could you give us some comparisons as to how the Hungarian uprising and the Polish uprisings were handled by the two respective radio networks, those internally controlled by the Communists. What were the people of these countries told by their own controlled state radio and what were they told by Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe?

Mr. DURKEE. Senator, I believe that the Commission's report has a very good example of our broadcasts on the Polish situation, but let me briefly summarize it for you.

We first had information about the riots on the coast through the monitoring of a local Polish radio that was reporting on disorder in

that city. We picked that up as a result of a listener in Sweden who called it to our attention. We then broadcast that to the people of Poland. This was the first information that the people of Poland had about any disorder on the seacoast. Subsequently we followed this story and it wasn't for over a day or a day and a half that the Polish Government itself acknowledged that there was that difficulty. As you know, it eventually led to a change in government in Poland. At first the Polish Government officially blamed us for the riots and then later issued various policy statements in which they acknowledged that the complaints of the workers on the coast were economic in origin and also lack of information and freedom to associate. In fact, those statements were very much like our broadcasts to Poland over a number of years.

With respect to Hungary, I was not present in Radio Free Europe at the time. I believe the kind of broadcasts that we made are well documented in two different studies, one by the German Government—by Chancellor Adenauer at the time—and the Council of Europe. There was some public concern we had stimulated that revolution. Of course, we had not. And these reports, I think, make it clear. We did some things at that time that we wouldn't have done now and didn't do later, either in Czechoslovakia or Poland. We did give some credibility to some Western reports that could have led the people of Hungary to believe there was going to be some aid available to them from the outside, but there was no explicit promise at that time but just bad reporting.

With that sole exception, that was the role Radio Free Europe played in those two specific instances and there was a similar instance in Czechoslovakia during the time of the Russian invasion. We were virtually the sole source of information for the Czech people about what was going on.

HANDLING OF EMIGRATION CONFRONTATION

Senator PERCY. Lastly, and particularly because of the very, very forceful and effective role our distinguished colleague from New York, Senator Javits, has played in the emigration of Jews from the Soviet Union to Israel, can you give some idea to the committee how much internal publicity the state radio has given to the people of the Soviet Union on the confrontation over emigration? It is a matter of interest, I think, to a great many people in the Soviet Union. And how is Radio Liberty handling this matter, and Radio Free Europe in the Eastern European countries?

Mr. SARGEANT. Well, Senator Percy, in the Soviet Union, although the decree that we speak about—the education tax decree—was actually known to Western correspondents in August of last year, there was no mention, I believe, in my Soviet media until January of 1973. So you had a period of at least 6 months before there was even an admission that such a decree existed. In the meantime—

Senator PERCY. You mean the fact that there was an exit tax placed on people?

Mr. SARGEANT. Yes, and it was being imposed on those Jews that sought to emigrate from the country. Of course, this was well known to all of the activists of the Soviet Union who were concerned, not solely with the status of Soviet Jews, but with human rights.

So that this was a broad interest among an extremely important group in the Soviet Union. Radio Liberty's role was essentially where there was a petition of a group of Jews asking that the Soviet constitutional guarantees of human rights be observed. If this came into the possession of Radio Liberty, we broadcast it back, thereby serving as an enormous echo chamber in making countless thousands of Soviet citizens aware who otherwise would have been completely in ignorance of the existence of this bar to emigration and of the failure to observe the constitution and statutes that had been in existence in the Soviet Union.

SOVIET MEDIA REPORTING CONCERNING JEWS WISHING TO RETURN

Senator PERCY. Although we know that there are perhaps 30,000 Soviet Jewish emigrants each year, I have seen some news reports that there are some who have wanted to return, and that is not surprising at all. People pick up and leave an area where they have lived all their lives and go to Shangri-la and find it doesn't fit their dreams exactly. Do you happen to know whether there has been information given out on Communist-controlled radio about these people who have wanted to return and what has been said about it? I ask the question without any knowledge at all as to whether they have broadcast that information.

Mr. SARGEANT. If I may answer that. I am not sure of the extent to which this has been done, but there have been several mentions in Soviet media of—I think it has been reported as at least a hundred of those who have emigrated to Israel who have been seeking to return. I do not know whether any of these who have actually returned have been given the normal propaganda treatment on return, which is that they are interviewed and their edited remarks appear in Pravda and Izvestia, are carried on the Radio Moscow home service, and on television. This would be normal, if this followed true to form. They would wish to make this stick in the minds of the Soviet citizen, and they would normally develop an internal propaganda campaign of this nature.

I do not know whether this has happened, but they have mentioned the existence of small numbers who wished to return, having been disappointed in the conditions they found in Israel.

[The information referred to follows:]

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON SOVIET MEDIA TREATMENT OF JEWISH EMIGRATION

[Supplied by the Department of State]

In January 1973 the Soviet literary newspaper Literaturnaya Gazeta quoted two letters from former Soviet citizens who had emigrated to Israel as a basis for attacking conditions in that country and pointing to the hard lesson taught to the emigrants by capitalist reality. The letters were presented as "living witness to the evil of Zionist propaganda," which was leading people to wish to emigrate to Israel in hopes of some kind of paradise.

Authoritative estimates are that of 32,000 emigrants from the U.S.S.R. to Israel, 16 families have since left that country. In the first six months of 1973, of a total of 13,029 persons who emigrated to Israel, 144 persons have moved onward. These estimates do not specify how many of those who left Israel did so with the intention of returning to the Soviet Union. However, newspaper reports in May of this year stated that 96 Jews who could not adjust to life in Israel were in Vienna awaiting visas in the hope of returning to the U.S.S.R.

Soviet propaganda on this subject has not been as extensive, as might have been expected, according to the normal Soviet pattern, but the reason may be that those who left Israel after emigrating there reportedly represent only one-half of 1 percent of those who emigrated.

COMPARATIVE REPORT ON BREZHNEV VISIT

Senator PERCY. Radio Free Europe's and Radio Liberty's existence has not impeded in any respect the forthcoming Brezhnev visit. So long as that visit, in their judgment, will serve their objectives and foreign policy, they won't let this affect it, but I would be most interested in an analysis being made as to how Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe handle that visit, how much reporting is given, the tone of that reporting, and I would like then to have a comparison with what was disseminated inside the Soviet Union by Soviet radio.

I am very grateful for your testimony this morning. It has been extremely helpful.

Mr. RUSH. We are very pleased to supply that to you, Senator Percy. Thank you.

[The information referred to follows:]

COVERAGE OF BREZHNEV VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES, JUNE 1973 BY SOVIET BLOC MEDIA, RADIO LIBERTY AND RADIO FREE EUROPE

[Supplied by the Department of State]

RADIO LIBERTY ANALYSIS

Soviet Media Coverage

Soviet internal media coverage of the visit of General Secretary Brezhnev to the United States represents one of the largest publicity efforts by the Soviet Government in the history of Soviet American relations and reveals the extent to which the Soviet media are adopting Western news reporting techniques. Coverage of Brezhnev's departure from the U.S. and the joint communique, for example, took up approximately 90% of the bulletins issued by TASS, the Soviet news agency, that day. Up-to-the-minute bulletins on Brezhnev's movements, live telecasts through the facilities of NBC, extensive interviews and reportage, as well as the full texts of the agreements signed, are further examples of the optimum coverage given the visit.

The characteristic omission, distortion and exaggeration in Soviet reporting, however, were still in evidence—in this case, as a result of a determination to present the visit in glowing colors with regard to prospects for world peace, future U.S.-Soviet commercial relations, and as a personal triumph for Brezhnev himself. Only cautionary repetition of the fact of long standing ideological differences between the countries is allowed to cast a slight haze over the picture. Soviet newsmen sought interviews and opinions to bolster their account from Americans ranging from major industrialists and technological leaders to Governor Rockefeller, from former Ambassador Harriman to U.S. Communist Party Chairman Gus Hall, from top academic economists to rank-and-file union members. As far as the content of the interviews and articles quoted went, however, one would think they were all written by the same script writer, since any remarks not in line with the optimistic Soviet view were omitted in the reporting. From the point of view of a good Communist, the remarkable consistency of viewpoint shared by everyone in the U.S. from labor to big business must have seemed bewildering.

Three major subject areas in particular connected with Brezhnev's visit were distorted or went unreported in the Soviet domestic media in accordance with the "accentuate the positive, eliminate the negative" bias:

1. The question of free emigration and other human rights issues in the Soviet Union;
2. The Watergate crisis both as a damper on U.S. interest in Brezhnev's visit and as it might have undermined Nixon's personal position as a negotiator;

3. Uncertainties among economists and others as to the advisability of expanded commercial relations on the basis of long-term credits and other economic questions.

The sore point of Jewish emigration from the USSR and its link to the most-favored-nation trade status for the Soviet Union by the Jackson-Vanek amendment has not been reported on at all, although Senator Jackson himself has been described by Soviet media as a lobbyist for the military-industrial complex and Zionist circles. When thousands of Jews and some other minority national groups of the Soviet Union demonstrated in Washington on June 17 for the right to emigration and other human rights curtailed in the Soviet Union, Radio Moscow's domestic service reported instead a smaller, peace march to the White House, in which marchers carried posters saying "Long live Leonid Brezhnev," "We welcome the visit of General Secretary Brezhnev." The service did not mention that these posters were among those carried by the Communist Party of the USA group in the march, or that the dominant character of the march was criticism of President Nixon with respect to Watergate and U.S. policies in Indo-China. Comments made by Brezhnev himself on the situation of Soviet Jews at his press conference with 11 Western journalists in Moscow on the eve of his trip and at a luncheon with members of the Senate in Washington also went unreported.

While Watergate was capturing headlines in the U.S. in the weeks preceding Brezhnev's visit, Soviet media gave the subject only cursory coverage and insisted that Brezhnev's visit was the event uppermost in the minds of the American public. (A BBC broadcast which pointed to a surprising lack of interest in the visit among Americans received a sharp attack over Radio Moscow.) Again, in reporting Brezhnev's meeting with the 11 Western journalists, TASS made no mention of reporters' queries on this attitude toward Nixon in light of Watergate. When the Soviet newspaper *Abroad* reprinted the text of Nixon's May 23 statement on Watergate, the paper implied that Nixon was answering irresponsible press accusations and printed the statement with the omission of any references made by Nixon to his fears that news leaks in the past might have injured his position in delicate negotiations then in progress.

Soviet reporters interviewed so many top industrialists and members of the Commerce Department that it would be difficult to check out the accuracy of all the stories, but it is significant that in the following examples Soviet radio broadcasts distorted the evaluations on the prospects for Soviet-American trade made by top U.S. economists whose words are in the public record. A Radio Moscow domestic service broadcast characterized Manufacturers Hanover Trust Board Chairman Gabriel Hauge as being very optimistic about trade between the two countries, but ignored the grave reservations with which Hauge accompanied his statements. Hauge had said that U.S. and Western banks, by slicing interest rates for the Soviets, were getting to the point where some loans were "dubious banking," and he called for "some sober second thoughts at the top" in other banks on the situation. Another broadcast, this time in English to the U.S., was based on a *Newsweek* article by the economist Paul Samuelson in which Samuelson was reported to have acknowledged "that the development of Soviet-American trade will benefit both the Soviet Union and, of course, also American companies taking part in it." The article failed to mention that Samuelson was basically pessimistic about the economic dividends of increased trade between the two nations, having stated: "I do not believe the rapprochement with Russia and China is of much economic importance . . . certainly our balance of payments will not be helped by any program that involves our expanding exports which are paid for only by I.O.U.'s."

In Soviet coverage of economic matters, the longstanding omission of background information on Soviet agricultural failures and industrial problems, including news of Soviet grain purchases from the United States in the past year, is particularly glaring. While playing down their own extensive needs, the Soviet media have tried to make it appear that on the balance it is the United States which is most desperate to develop better relations and trade between the two countries. As *Izvestia* stated June 20, quoting in part from a James Reston column in *The New York Times*, better relations have become almost a "historical imperative" for Nixon because of the "energy shortage, inflation, taxes, urban development, employment and others. . . . It is essentially a question of millions of people's hopes in the fact that under conditions of stability and durable relaxation of tension, it will be possible to turn means and resources to peaceful civilian needs." Although such a statement could easily be reversed and applied to the Soviet Union itself, this is never done in Soviet media.

Soviet media do not ignore entirely negative comments by Americans on Brezhnev's visit and the prospect of improved relations between the two countries, but while positive commentary is quoted with direct attribution, even when distorted reservations are usually couched in imprecise terms with a tone of ridicule and without direct attribution. Thus, "lovers of somber forecasts" are said to have "croaked that there was no reason to hope for any constructive decisions." "Certain reactionary circles" "still thinking in cold war terms, are attempting almost to set their own 'terms' to the Soviet Union or to depict matters as if the broadening of U.S.-Soviet trade and economic ties, for example, is in keeping with the interests of one side alone and is not mutually advantageous." Except for the symbolic use of "cold war" and "terms" in a statement like this, no mention at all is made of the fact that the most important issues to many who do hesitate to endorse improved commercial relations wholeheartedly are the human rights issues of the treatment of Jews, dissidents and national minorities in the Soviet Union and the freedom of information and travel, AFL-CIO leader George Meany, Senator Jackson and a number of newspaper correspondents are among the few cautionary speakers who are attacked directly.

In connection with this, it should be noted that the Soviet media have been quoting extensively from the world press in reporting on Brezhnev's visit, but not always accurately. A paraphrase of a *New York Times* editorial on June 16 was used in a Radio Moscow domestic broadcast to focus on American acceptance of the end of the cold war and the great respect with which Brezhnev would be greeted by Americans. The Soviet broadcast neglected to mention, however, the fact that the editorial went on to accuse Brezhnev of disingenuousness on the issue of Watergate and Nixon's position with regard to it and on the emigration of Soviet Jews.

Moscow's propaganda apparatus has a formula for dismissing the significance of U.S. press reports that go against its interest. "The extent of the contradictoriness and complexity of American reality was striking on first contact to us Soviet journalists . . ." an *Izvestia* article stated June 20 . . . "The same newspaper page often carries essentially directly contradictory articles—responsible and irresponsible, sensible and nonsensical, objective and tendentious." The importance of the expression of a variety of opinions in a free press is, of course, ignored.

Radio Liberty's Coverage

On a story of worldwide significance like Brezhnev's visit to the United States, Radio Liberty's broadcasts play a special role in reporting and analyzing the news in a way focused directly on the Soviet citizens' own interests and background and with recognition of the major gaps and distortions in the information provided by Soviet internal media.

Radio Liberty covered Brezhnev's visit through up-to-the-minute news reports, reviews of the world press and in-depth analyses. In the months preceding the visit, broadcasts included extensive background material unavailable in Soviet media on both the Soviet and the American economies, on SALT talks and European security, as well as on political issues influencing leaders of both countries. Western evaluations of Brezhnev's position following the recent shake-up in the Soviet leadership and the main elements of the Washington political scene in light of the Watergate crisis were both reported. A series called "Basis for Hope" included interviews with heads of U.S. corporations and cultural groups engaged in new ventures with the Soviet Union in the past year. Radio Liberty has reported extensively on the protests of Soviet Jews seeking to emigrate and on Western support for them and other Soviet citizens fighting for their human rights.

This kind of backgrounding laid the groundwork for special features broadcast during Brezhnev's visit:

Filling a major gap in Soviet coverage, Radio Liberty's Washington correspondent reported directly on the mass demonstrations in Washington June 17 on behalf of Soviet Jews and in defense of fundamental human rights. The feature quoted Senator Jackson's speech on the importance for an individual to have the right to live where he chooses and emphasized that the demonstration was not anti-Soviet. Speakers at the rally approved of détente and hoped for positive results from the Nixon-Brezhnev talks.

Other appeals by various U.S. and international groups during Brezhnev's visit were also broadcast. In a program entitled "Through the Eyes of a Recent Muscovite" a young Russian emigrant himself described a demonstration in New York in support of Soviet political prisoners and told of

numerous activities by the American public in support of persons persecuted in the Soviet Union because of their convictions.

Using an exclusive report by Senator Humphrey on Brezhnev's luncheon meeting with members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee June 19, Radio Liberty was able to give full information on Brezhnev's remarks and and to put Brezhnev's words on the record for Soviet citizens on the statistics as to the number of Jewish emigrants to leave the Soviet Union in the past year and for his statement that Jews wishing to emigrate from the Soviet Union are not discriminated against. Another feature on the same topic compared Soviet press coverage of the meeting with the Senators with the information provided by other world news media.

Radio Liberty also broadcast interviews with Senators Percy and Jackson and quoted from Senator Fulbright's ABC-TV interview on impressions made by Brezhnev's visit.

A number of broadcasts analyzed the importance of Brezhnev's visit as a step toward improving U.S.-Soviet relations in view of the agreements signed on preventing nuclear war, on cooperation in research on the use of atomic energy and the intention expressed by both the U.S. and the USSR of concluding an agreement on limiting strategic offensive weapons.

Radio Liberty drew on the statements and expertise of prominent dissident spokesmen in the Soviet Union, noting that Academician Sakharov (known as "Father of the Soviet H-bomb"), Professor Turchin and the Soviet historian Medvedev have written to Brezhnev, Kosygin and Podgorny on the problems of the Soviet economy and calling for major efforts to solve them. Five years ago Sakharov had circulated an unpublished memorandum "Progress, Intellectual Freedom and Coexistence" calling urgently for bilateral cooperation on such matters as disarmament and environmental control. He reiterated his demands in a second memorandum published in the West a year ago. Both of these documents and other writings of dissidents which are unpublished in the Soviet Union have been broadcast over Radio Liberty, the major Western broadcaster of unpublished writings by Soviet citizens that find their way to the West. The close correlation of the Soviet-American agreements signed last year in Moscow and during Brezhnev's visit to the United States this year with the recommendations of Sakharov is striking.

Finally, Radio Liberty has the distinction of having provided the Soviet Government the opportunity of jamming the words of its own leader. Radio Liberty broadcast in full the text of Brezhnev's TV speech on June 24 and again on June 25. There was no let up whatsoever in the jamming of Radio Liberty, although the broadcast of Mr. Brezhnev's speech live over the Voice of America went completely unjammed to the USSR. All regularly scheduled Voice of America programs before and after it were jammed as usual.

In the weeks to come Radio Liberty will continue to carry follow-up stories on Brezhnev's visit, quoting analysts writing in the world press and providing information on the ways in which the agreements signed are being carried out.

RADIO FREE EUROPE ANALYSIS—I. NEWS COVERAGE

Except for the Rumanian press and radio, which merely announced in a few words the arrival of Brezhnev and the beginning of official talks, all East European media (Polish, Czechoslovak, Hungarian and Bulgarian) from the outset gave the Soviet-American summit meeting front-page treatment, very heavy coverage, and priority in their radio newscasts.

As the visit went on, in Bulgaria, the coverage was even stepped up, especially by *Radio Sofia*, and in Czechoslovakia the summit talks took priority in almost all radio and TV newscasts over the historic Bonn-Prague treaty annulling the Munich agreement. In contrast, however, the Polish press and radio definitely gave precedence to the Gierek-Honecker talks taking place at the same time in East Berlin: they received at least twice the coverage given to Brezhnev and Nixon.

Coverage of the Brezhnev-Nixon summit talks began to decline somewhat in the Czechoslovak and Bulgarian information media on June 25, although the Polish and Hungarian media maintained their extensive treatment of the previous days. An exception was the Brezhnev address to the American people, which got special treatment everywhere but in Rumania. Bulgarian radio and television broadcast it in full, as did Czechoslovak TV, while the Bulgarian

dailies *Rabotnichesko Delo* (the Party organ) and *Narodna Mladezh* (the youth organ), and the Polish Party daily *Trybuna Ludu*, Hungarian dailies printed extensive excerpts.

Radio Warsaw's New York correspondent declared that Brezhnev's every gesture and smile, as well as his walks with President Nixon, had become known to all Americans and, indeed, become a part of their daily life. Despite this, he said, Brezhnev's TV address had been a "revelation" to the American people, who had been "utterly fascinated" by his performance.

The leading Polish dailies added a selection of favorable U.S. editorial comments.

Analysis of Radio Newscasts

Day-by-day comparison of peak-hour evening news programs of the five East European radio networks with corresponding RFE newscasts show only two constants:

Ignoring, by the East European radios, of any aspect of the Jewish emigration question: the confrontation of Brezhnev on the subject at his luncheon with Senate Foreign Relations Committee members (and his statistical defense); manifestations by or on behalf of Jews during the Brezhnev visit; or the connection between the issue and the question of MFN status for the Soviet Union.

A tendency to delay in reporting important developments (e.g., the agreement on nuclear testing) in any detail—presumably until a precise, approved interpretation of the matter was available.

Aside from these specifics, the common quality of East European newscasts is the wide variety of styles used.

Hungarian newscasts consistently adhered to standards and techniques close to those of American radio; there was not a great deal to choose between them and the corresponding RFE casts in completeness or objectivity . . . except for their ignoring of the Jewish emigration issue. Agreements were explained clearly and in some detail; President Nixon's comments on the progress of the meeting were quoted almost as fully as those of Brezhnev; and there was even one brief report on Presidential Advisor Kissinger's briefing of the press. A news story on the final communique broke with the tradition of giving all credit to the USSR by reporting:

" . . . the communique established that mainly as a result of the joint efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States, the preparatory work for the conference on security has been successfully completed."

Polish radio newscasts, aside from ignoring the Jewish emigration issue, gave relatively complete if usually perfunctory information on events of the meeting. Little space was given to quoting the Soviet leader, much less Mr. Nixon; in fact, Polish listeners would have heard a great deal more about Brezhnev's thoughts on the progress of the meetings and prospects for future Soviet-U.S. cooperation from RFE broadcasts than from the corresponding Radio Warsaw casts.

Czechoslovak newscasts varied between fairly detailed accounts of the day's events and terse references to the fact that meetings had taken place, sometimes embellished with laudatory quotes from other East European media. The luncheon meeting of Brezhnev with a group of senators, at which the Jewish emigration question was broached, was handled by a brief news note avoiding all details.

Bulgarian radio news handling was generally lacking in details, and again left most of the quoting of Brezhnev's remarks of RFE, although the President was quoted on two occasions. A special feature was the reporting of comments by Western Communist leaders: Harry Winston (twice) and Gus Hall of the U.S. Party, and the Argentine Party's General Secretary Arnedo Alvares.

Rumanian radio news coverage began with a few lines per program, but gradually expanded:

Rumania the Exception

For most of the Brezhnev visit, Rumania remained the only Warsaw Pact country to treat the Brezhnev-Nixon summit talks as a non-event. There were no commentary either by press or radio, and Agerpres, the Rumanian news agency, was the only East European agency which completely failed to mention the visit in its international service. Moreover, news reports were being published on the last page in the daily press.

Toward the end of the visit, while the Rumania media still carried no commentaries on the subject, there was an increase in the amount of news provided

by both press and radio. News columns, for example, increased from 75-line reports and less to between 150 and 200 lines, while *Radio Bucharest* carried somewhat longer and more numerous items in its newscasts. Once again, however, the daily papers tended to publish such material on the last page. Finally, the Rumanian press ignored the TV address, but carried—on the back page—quotations of roughly one-tenth of the final communique. The only other item singled out by the Rumanian press of June 26 was an Agerpres report on a Brezhnev meeting with a group of American businessmen, which stressed his remarks on U.S.-Soviet economic cooperation and on mutual “non-interference in internal affairs.”

While Rumania was unique in the universally scant coverage by its media, some differences were evident in the degree of attention given by individual media elsewhere. In Poland, for example, while the visit was reported and commented on each day by *Trybuna Ludu* and *Zycie Warszawy*, the soldiers' daily *Zolnierz Wolnosci* seemed to minimize its importance. The trade-union paper *Glos Pracy* also gave it considerably less space, especially in contrast to its coverage of Gierek's GDR visit, as did the PAX (pro-regime Catholic) daily *Slowo Powszechne*, whose commentaries preferred to stress Poland's contribution, via its role in organizing the Helsinki conference, to the success of the US-Soviet summit.

II. STRESSES IN EAST EUROPEAN COVERAGE

While strictly newcast items on East European radio and TV were generally factual, longer reportages in the newspapers from their Washington correspondents, and analyses written by their foreign affairs specialists, emphasized certain recurrent themes:

MEETING A “VICTORY” FOR SOVIET POLICY

First, the meeting was pictured as a victory for the Soviet Union's consistent policy of peaceful coexistence, with some comments giving credit to the socialist world as a whole. Washington was credited with adopting a more “realistic” attitude, which helped make the meeting possible, but this realism is attributed not to the wisdom of the U.S. leadership or any change in the “imperialist” attitude. On the contrary, the Communist media generally asserted that America's more cooperative stance had been forced on it by a change in the international balance of power to the advantage of the world socialist system, and by the Soviet initiative to eliminate international tensions.

This thesis appeared, for example, in articles in the Slovak Party daily *Pravda*, the Slovak youth daily *Smena*, and the Bulgarian agricultural organ *Zemеделске Zname* on June 19; the commentary in the last paper was supplied by the Soviet news agency *Novosti*. The Czechoslovak Party daily *Rude Pravo* of June 20 also asserted that the success of the Nixon-Brezhnev talks thus far had been the result of the “continuous and purposeful effort of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries directed toward a relaxation of international tensions.”

More vehement was a commentary in the Czechoslovak Central Committee weekly *Tribuna* of June 20, which declared that the considerable growth of the military, economic, and political power of the socialist countries, “led by the Soviet Union”, had been a factor that had significantly moved “the indicator” toward peace. Noting the hostile attitude of the “imperialist states”, the paper stressed that complete disarmament could only be achieved “after the definite victory of socialism over capitalism. The imperialists do not yield anything without a struggle: They fear only those who are strong”, the article said.

Again a broadcast over *Radio Sofia* on June 23 by the Bulgarian press agency (BTA) American correspondent flatly asserted that the signing of the agreement on prevention of nuclear war had been possible for four reasons:

1. The fact that the socialist system had established itself as the decisive power in the world;
2. The elimination of the nuclear threat of the cold-war period, because the USSR had become a genuine shield against nuclear adventures;
3. The fact that the ruling circles in the U.S., under pressure of reality, had changed their policy toward the USSR; and
4. The development of lively and “insistent” diplomatic activity under the prodding of the Soviet Union.

Toward the end of the visit, several East European dailies returned to the theme of past American guilt for international tensions and almost complete Soviet responsibility for the trend toward detente between the US and USSR. For example, the Hungarian Party organ *Nepszabadsag* of June 24 asserted that the agreement on the prevention of nuclear war represented a verdict of condemnation for the "imperialistic American policy" of nuclear threats vis-a-vis the Soviet Union over the past 25 years. On the same day, the semiofficial government daily *Magyar Hirlap* attributed the positive results of the summit talks to U.S. recognition of the consistent foreign policy of the USSR and its position of eminence in world affairs. The Czechoslovak Party organ *Rude Pravo* of June 25 placed the summit's achievements within the framework of the six-point peace program of the 24th Soviet Party Congress.

This theme continued after the end of the visit; several commentaries attributed the success to the Soviet Union and other peace-loving socialist countries and to Brezhnev personally. A *Radio Prague* panel discussion of June 26 heavily underlined the importance of the changed balance of world forces in favor of socialism. At the same time, a note of caution was sounded by some of the commentaries. *Magyar Nemzet* of June 26, for instance, recalled that despite the progress for the two countries and for all mankind which the summit represented, it was only the "beginning of the great road."

On this issue as most others, the Rumanian media remained silent.

"Reactionary Circles" Still Oppose Improved Relations

Overall stress on the achievements (primarily Soviet) of the meeting was accompanied by warnings that there were "reactionaries" and "capitalist circles" which still tried to put obstacles in the way of better Soviet-American relations. References to the conditions being proposed against most-favored-nation trade status for the Soviet Union were completely avoided, as was any reference to U.S. congressional concern over the Jewish emigration problem. Senator Jackson and other "Neanderthal rightists" were singled out for attack by the Hungarian Party daily *Nepszabadsag*, June 16, but on the grounds that they were attempting to use the Watergate issue as a level to defeat the President's detente policy.

Later, the Bulgarian *Robotnichesko Delo* and *Trud* of June 27, said "There are still capitalist circles that are trying to cast a shadow over the favorable development of Soviet-American relations and to create obstacles to the improvement of the international political atmosphere." Or, as *Magyar Nemzet's* Washington correspondent noted (June 26), "the character of American imperialism has not been changed by the recognition of realities. There are still people who profit from armaments, the bombing of Cambodia continues, and there will always be Watergate affairs in a capitalist society."

For contrast, East European media put considerable stress on the reported enthusiastic reaction of the U.S. public to Brezhnev's arrival and to the meeting as a whole. East European correspondents reported from Washington that the American public in general had a very positive attitude toward the Brezhnev visit, and that the Soviet Embassy has been receiving numerous letters and telegrams from representatives of U.S. public life, as well as simple people, all warmly welcoming the stay of the Soviet leader.

Economic Benefits

The Soviet desire for economic assistance from the West—capital, development aid, and advanced technological know-how—is scarcely a secret in the outside world, but was played down throughout the Brezhnev visit. Polish and Bulgarian media gave the impression that it was the United States which desired and needed Soviet aid, while Hungarian articles asserted defensively that the Soviet Union had no need of U.S. technology and know-how in order to raise its standard of living.

Jewish Emigration Issue

The most glaring omission in the voluminous reporting by East European media was total silence on the question of Jewish emigration: there was no mention of the questions raised by U.S. Senators at their luncheon meeting with Brezhnev—nor of his prepared reply—nor of the obstacle created by the issue to the granting of most-favorable-nation status to the Soviet Union, although Senator Jackson was criticized as a "reactionary" and opponent of better Soviet-U.S. relations, without specifics.

The meeting between Brezhnev and members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was reported in positive tones, but with no mention of the fact that the question of Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union had been raised and discussed.

Although Senators Fulbright and Aiken were cited as having expressed gratitude and satisfaction over the results of this meeting (*Trybuna Ludu* and *Radio Budapest* of June 21), nothing is mentioned of the reservations or skepticism voiced by other Senators. The boycotting of the subject lasted throughout the visit. It remained for RFE to report Brezhnev's statistics offered at the Senate lunch.

III. REPORTING OF WESTERN COMMENT

If East European reporting of news per se tended to be relatively straightforward, this cannot be said of the reporting of Western press comment. Some media avoided it altogether; others selected only comments (or parts of comments, out of context) which supported the thesis that the Brezhnev trip was a total success.

Rumanian media failed to cite any foreign—let alone U.S. and West European press comment—at all. The radio and papers of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland handled comment in the Western press in more or less uniform fashion, the preferred framework being a brief summary of Eastern and Western views on the visit. More often than not direct quotations were limited to a sentence or two. A report by *Radio Budapest's* New York correspondent on June 16 on *Wall Street Journal* and *Washington Post* editorials which ran about 100 words all told, was a rare exception. In addition to these two newspapers, the *New York Times* and the *Christian Science Monitor* appear to have been used most frequently. But such assorted publications as *Business Week*, *New York Daily News*, the *Boston Herald American* and *Current History* also were quoted.

Generally, however, the content of Western editorials was paraphrased or quoted in no more than a sentence or two, with stress almost entirely on the "positive" elements of the visit. However, some press summaries in the East European newspapers at least alluded to the existence of more hostile Western views—even if these were not spelled out. Thus *Trybuna Ludu* of June 26 attacked the West German *Die Welt* for "anti-detente views, characteristic of the nationalistic Springer concern". *Radio Homeland* (Hungary) of June 27 attacked "certain" Western papers for trying to belittle the summit results or claiming that they had been made "over the heads of the peoples."

The only instance where an East European paper was more explicit about the nature of these "hostile" views was in *Zemledelsko Zname* (Bulgaria) of June 27, which cited a Stewart Alsop *Newsweek* article: Alsop was quoted as saying that the "USSR is preparing secret plans for a nuclear attack on China." The paper accused him of spreading false rumors to scare world public opinion.

Also the Polish weekly *Polityka* of June 23 devoted a paragraph of a review of Western press comment on the Brezhnev visit to an article by Zbigniew Brzezinski in the *New Leader* of June 11. But the summary omitted Brzezinski's key theme that both sides would be confronting each other from a position of weakness, as well as his conclusion about the lessening preeminence of the U.S.-Soviet relationship.

Quotations used by the East European media all pointed in the same direction: underlining the positive benefits of the visit for the cause of world peace and the improvement of U.S.-Soviet relations. The only polemical accent found was in an occasional quotation from the Western Communist press: thus *Radio Prague* of June 23, after having referred to two rather bland French comments, reported a *Morning Star* (British CP paper) attack on the "extreme rightist and aggressive forces of capitalism" for their opposition to U.S.-Soviet understanding.

All critical remarks in Western press editorials on the visit or the Soviet Union have been scrupulously avoided. *Radio Warsaw's* coverage of the *New York Times* lead editorial on the day of Brezhnev's arrival was typical: Washington correspondent Jan Zakrzewski quoted the opening the editorial, hailing Brezhnev's arrival as a "sign of a very substantial thaw." He omitted next four paragraphs of the editorial, which criticized Brezhnev for his "disingenuous" remarks on the Watergate affair and on the emigration of Soviet Jews. Zakrzewski then concluded by quoting from the final paragraph of the editorial: "A really productive long-term era of Soviet-American cooperation is impossible without mutual candor", although the reference to "mutual candor" could only have been understood properly in the context of the sections Zakrzewski had omitted.

There were also two attacks on sections of the U.S. press: An article in the Slovak Party daily *Pravda* (June 22) by its Washington correspondent, Arnost Bak, charged that the U.S. press is a slave to its own sensationalist attitudes

and to its cold-war vocabulary. It does not cease, he said, to play up the forces which intentionally cast doubts on the possibilities for and advantages of peaceful cooperation between the U.S. and USSR. Also on June 25 Czechoslovak TV attacked what it called the "reactionary capitalist press", which before the Brezhnev trip had allegedly maintained that the Soviet Union would henceforth forget the West European states and would even act against their interests. The commentator added that the Soviet leader's current trip to France demonstrated how much these calumnies have been unjustified.

RFE Reporting of Western Press

In contrast to the guarded and generally selective character of East European reports on Western comment, RFE devoted a full half of its programs other than newscasts to reflecting the views of American, West European and other newspapers. Between June 16 and 25, press reviews in the five RFE services totaled 437 minutes, or about nine minutes per country per day. The publications quoted once or more often included:

United States: Baltimore Sun; Christian Science Monitor; International Herald-Tribune; Los Angeles Times; New Leader; Newsweek; New York Daily News; New York Times; Philadelphia Inquirer; U.S. News and World Report; Wall Street Journal; Washington Evening Star; Washington Post.

Britain: Guardian; Observer; Financial Times; Daily Telegraph; Sunday Telegraph; Daily Times; Sunday Times (all London).

West Germany: Die Welt (Hamburg); Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung; Frankfurter Rundschau; Muenchener Merkur; Stuttgarter Zeitung; Sueddeutsche Zeitung (Munich).

France: L'Aurore; Combat; La Croix; Les Echos; Le Figaro; France Soir; Le Monde; La Nation (all Paris).

Italy: Corriere della Sera (Milan); Il Messaggero and Il Popolo (Rome); La Stampa (Turin).

Sweden: Arbeter (Malmo); Dagen Nyheter and Svenska Dagbladet (Stockholm); Handelstidningen (Goteborg).

Denmark: Information. (Copenhagen).

Egypt: Al Ahram; Al Nida (Cairo).

Israel: Jerusalem Post.

Norway: Aftenposten (Oslo).

Switzerland: Journal de Geneve.

Polish exile journal: Kultura (Paris).

Also cross-reported to other East European countries were:

Bulgaria: Trud.

Czechoslovakia: Pravda.

Hungary: Nepszabadsag.

Poland: Zycie Warszawy.

RADIO LIBERTY AND RADIO FREE EUROPE FAVORED

Senator JAVITS. Senator, I have been engaged in pension and welfare testimony this morning before the Finance Committee, but I wanted the Secretary and his associates to know that I am very favorable to Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. I have examined the radio stations and I am very familiar with their work both in Berlin and in Munich, and I would just like to ask one question.

COMMISSION'S POSITION ON FINANCING RADIOS

I notice in the report of the Presidential Study Commission reference is expressly made to our getting cooperation from other countries bearing the cost of these radios, and I noticed that the report states the following: "The Commission therefore believes the stations must continue to be financed mainly by U.S. appropriated funds." Apparently some assistance in research from other sources is considered desirable and private European contributions for all purposes

should be sought, but not financial support from European governments.

Could the Secretary tell us how he feels about that and why?

Mr. RUSH. Senator Javits, I agree with the Commission that it is very important that these stations continue to operate as they have in the past, which is in large measure to let the people of the U.S.S.R. know what is happening in their own country and the peoples of the Warsaw Pact countries to know what is happening in their countries primarily—and over half of the broadcasts are directed toward that effort—and also to let them know what is happening in the free world.

If we had multinational operation of these stations, I am afraid and the Commission is afraid that this objective might be very seriously diluted, because we do not have identical foreign policy objectives in all cases with our allies in NATO or our other friends in Western Europe, and we would not be able to carry out the concept that is outlined by the Commission with regard to the operation of the stations if we permitted other countries to also bring in their managers to decide how these radios should be operated.

So that our feeling is that the benefit we would receive from direct grants for operating expenses of the stations from other countries would be more than offset by the very heavy price of dilution of programming effectiveness and of management.

We found, for example, in NATO that getting a unanimous approach to various items that we have wanted can be extremely difficult—with regard to the news and with regard to other things—and any one nation can block it, as was recently done in the case, for example, of maneuvers by our naval forces by one small country in NATO. So that our feeling is that where we are letting people know what is going on, in their country and in the free world, it is better to stick primarily to this objective and not dilute it by having different concepts of different countries come in and be required to try to reach a consensus.

We feel in that case probably the blandest and the minimal would always be the thing adopted; otherwise one could not get unanimous consent.

RADIO PEACE AND PROGRESS

Senator JAVITS. Is there any radio that the Russians have beamed all over the world, similar to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty? Do they have some designated trade name for it?

Mr. RUSH. They have, for example, a so-called unofficial radio called "Radio Peace and Progress" which they use.

Senator JAVITS. For the same purpose as our radios?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir.

Senator JAVITS. To tell us what is happening in their country?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir.

Senator JAVITS. In view of the fact that you advocate that we use the Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe as essentially an indigenous effort to project information, do we have any estimate of what the Russians do through their station, whom are they reaching, how effective is it and so on?

Mr. RUSH. The U.S.S.R. broadcasts a total of about 1,900 program hours per week, of which 250 hours are beamed toward North America either in English or ethnic languages known to people in our country.

Their broadcasts are, of course, their basic controlled propaganda telling us what they want, telling these people what they want them to hear, and usually very unfavorably to us.

U.S. AUDIENCE OF RADIO PEACE AND PROGRESS

Senator JAVITS. But do we have any estimate of the extent of the audience in this country?

Mr. RUSH. Senator Javits, in this country it is estimated that only 3 or 4 Americans listen to short-wave foreign broadcasts.

Senator JAVITS. Out of how many?

Mr. RUSH. Out of a hundred.

Senator JAVITS. Three or 4 percent of the population in your judgment listens to short-wave?

Mr. RUSH. Yes, sir.

Senator JAVITS. How many radio sets are there in the United States, 60 or 70 million?

Mr. RUSH. There is a tremendous number.

Senator JAVITS. We ought to have some estimate, some order of magnitude. Are there 60 or 70 million, something like that?

Mr. RUSH. You mean short-wave?

Senator JAVITS. Yes.

Mr. RUSH. We will supply that for the record.

EXTENT OF U.S. AND RUSSIAN AUDIENCES AND BROADCASTING

Senator JAVITS. Also what is the 4 percent? Is it 4 percent of all radios, or is the 4 percent applicable only to owners of short-wave receivers? In short, we ought to have a juxtaposition between what Radio Liberty and what Radio Free Europe reach in the way of audience compared to what the Russians reach and then also a comparison in hours broadcast; then we would have some evidence as to whether we have a right by way of counterpropaganda to run our stations.

[The information referred to follows:]

SHORTWAVE RADIO RECEIVERS IN THE UNITED STATES, THE U.S.S.R., AND
EASTERN EUROPE

(Supplied by Department of State)

Of the approximately 100 million radio receivers in the Soviet Union, an estimated 34 million are capable of receiving short-wave foreign broadcasts. Of some 16 million receivers in the five East European countries to which RFE broadcasts, an estimated 14 million can receive short-wave.

In the United States there are about 350 million receivers, but only an estimated 2 million are capable of receiving foreign short-wave broadcasts.

One reason for the difference may be that distances between the United States and the major short-wave broadcasters are greater, and listening is therefore more difficult. However, another reason unquestionably is the quantity and variety of information on both international and domestic matters available to American listeners from their domestic networks and independent stations . . . both radio and television.

For example, the authoritative World Radio and TV Handbook for 1973 lists 250 major American radio stations (10 kilowatt or larger) on the medium-wave AM band alone.

There are also more than 6,000 FM or low-power AM stations available for local listening. TV stations number more than 900. In New York City, as one

example, the listener has a choice of at least 33 separately operated radio stations and 12 TV stations.

By contrast, domestic media in the Soviet Union and East Europe offer their listeners a choice of from two to four radio channels—AM or FM—and one or two TV channels, per country. But the choice of sources of broadcast information is even narrower than these figures suggest, since in each country all services are under the same “management”—i.e., the government and the Party leadership.

It is against this background of information on radio receiving sets that any comparison of respective audience sizes for RFE and RL in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and for Radio Moscow in the US must be made. Radio Liberty estimates that its broadcasts to the USSR are heard by roughly 30 million people. RFE estimates that over 30 million listen to its broadcasts. There is no available sampling of Radio Moscow's audience in the US for its short-wave broadcasts in English to North America or for broadcasts in English, Polish, and other languages to North America by the five Eastern European Countries to which RFE broadcasts. These broadcasts total 250 hours weekly as opposed to 1085 hours weekly by RFE and into the USSR broadcasting in 23 languages. However, with only 2 million sets in the US capable of receiving foreign short-wave broadcasts, it seems unlikely that the audience is significant. Both for this reason, and because information about the Soviet Union reaches the US public easily through the unrestricted sale of Soviet and Eastern European newspapers, periodicals, and books, the Soviets and their allies put greater emphasis on other media than radio in attempting to reach the US public. This, plus the fact that they need broadcast only in English to reach the entire audience in the US accounts for the smaller number of broadcast hours in relation to RFE and RL which must broadcast in 23 languages to reach their audience in that area.

Mr. RUSH. We will be glad to supply that for the record, Senator Javits.

I might say that we think there are some 34 million sets in the Soviet Union capable of receiving short-wave foreign broadcasts; thus about 60 percent of the adults in the U.S.S.R. have access to such broadcasts. And we think about 30 million in the five countries served by RFE have short-wave reception and listen to these broadcasts.

Senator JAVITS. Well, let us have those figures. I think those will be very valuable. Personally I hope we do continue these agencies. I think we ought to show the same alertness, same flexibility, the same capability for reaching over what still persists as an Iron Curtain that we have had before, especially if we are going to be pursuing policies which need to be broadcast to the Russian people. For example, Senator Percy questioned you about the matter of the exit tax on Soviet Jews. I think the very important thing in that regard is that the Soviet Union is a party to an international convention which assures freedom of travel, which they are violating. I think this is a very different argument. The expression of our humanitarian interest in the lowering of the emigration bars on their people.

Thank you.

Mr. RUSH. Thank you, Senator Javits.

NOTHING IN THE COMMISSION REPORT WITH WHICH WITNESS DISAGREES

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, is there anything in the Commission report with which you disagree?

Mr. RUSH. I hate to be a yes-man, Mr. Chairman, but there is nothing in the report with which I disagree.

The CHAIRMAN. It is purely a coincidence, of course.

CONTRAST BETWEEN NOWAK LETTER AND KAISER ARTICLES

I hate to pursue this. We have Mr. Eisenhower waiting. But are you familiar, Mr. Secretary, with the articles by Mr. Robert Kaiser that were recently reported from Moscow on April 10 and May 2?

Mr. RUSH. No, I am not.

The CHAIRMAN. You are not familiar with them?

Mr. RUSH. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read you one paragraph. You have covered this subject about their attitude. I will read you one paragraph from Mr. Nowak's letter and then what Mr. Kaiser reports from Moscow. It seems the contrast is very significant. This was written last year. Mr. Nowak wrote, "With some bitterness, I must confess I am not always successful in the above efforts"—he was talking about getting support for Radio Free Europe—"probably due to the instability of human convictions, to the effects of everything that comes with the so-called 'progress of civilization,' and, naturally, due to the near-sightedness of some primitively thinking politicians who fully believe in the tales of coexistence, détente, Communists good will, and other nonsense like this. I think this states very succinctly what their attitude is."

This is very striking, I think—"primitively thinking politicians who fully believe in the tales of coexistence, détente, Communist good will and other nonsense like this."

I would think President Nixon would be a little surprised to have Mr. Nowak call his policy "nonsense like this."

Mr. Kaiser reports in an article on April 10, appearing in the Washington Post:

In recent days, Soviet newspapers and television have expanded a propaganda campaign apparently intended to explain improved Soviet-American relations to the public. Readers and viewers have been given unprecedented exposure to articles, speeches and reports on how well relations are developing between the super powers, and how good this is for all concerned.

Then I will skip just a couple of paragraphs.

So much publicly expressed enthusiasm also seems to indicate the extent to which the Soviet leadership is now committed to a better relationship with the United States.

Apparently the Soviets believe in that nonsense of détente and coexistence. Mr. Kaiser goes on to say that:

The new propaganda campaign pops up in unexpected places. For example, one evening last week tens of millions of Soviet citizens watched the telecast of the Soviet-Czechoslovak hockey game in the current world championship competition. Between the first and second periods of the game, these millions of hockey fans saw a speech by the Minister of Health, Boris Petrovsky, who extolled the benefits of Soviet-American cooperation in medical research.

He says:

Several of the recent newspaper articles indicate official sensitivity to the charge that Soviet-American cooperation is essentially "one-sided" American aid to the Soviet Union. These articles insist that both countries are making an equal contribution to each other's knowledge and well-being.

I understand these are broadcasts and speeches to their own people, not to somebody else.

Then Mr. Kaiser on May 2 says:

Soviet newspaper readers have a chance to read something unusual these days—long detailed accounts of life in America which are friendly, fair and virtually devoid of propaganda.

Strelnikov and Peskov spent 6 weeks touring America in a Gran Torino—"a Ford of perfect quality"—that is a commercial I will give them free:

They explained to their readers. They've written a dozen long articles on the trip, half of which have now appeared.

This was about a trip these two men took across America.

Their pieces reflect a deliberate policy decision by the Communist Party Central Committee and Soviet editors to improve America's image. Other capitalist countries are due to benefit from the same kind of friendly treatment, according to Soviet editors. This new approach to news about the "ideological enemy" reflects the Government's new emphasis on international detente.

In the past Soviet coverage of the United States was concentrated on information that reflected badly on American society. In most cases, Soviet reports are factually accurate but onesided. They were often based on critical articles in the American press.

Strelnikov and Peskov have ignored that tradition with gay abandon. They write with exuberance and approval about many aspects of American life and their criticisms are calm and reasonable. Some American residents of Moscow who have been reading the articles even find them a little too generous. The most recent piece to appear describes American roadside restaurants with some awe. The speed of service amazes the authors, especially in a drive-in restaurant. The smiling helpful waitress with her ever-present glass of ice water delights them. Col. Sanders' chicken in every corner of the country impresses them. And ketchup on every table is a fool's delight: "One of us even ate tomatoes with ketchup."

This sounds like Dennis-the-Menace.

There is one drawback. Apart from the ketchup, nothing tastes very good. Foods produced "on the conveyer belt" are fresh, clean and filling but bland. On the other hand, the efficiency of it all largely compensates for tastelessness.

These Soviet visitors found Americans to be "prudent, thrifty, but not stingy." Most Americans didn't seem very curious to them. "We asked the questions during our conversations."

These Americans have one weakness: they like to boast.

[The articles referred to follow:]

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 10, 1973]

SOVIET PROPAGANDA SELLING IMPROVED U.S. TIES TO PUBLIC

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

Moscow, April 9—In recent days, Soviet newspapers and television have expanded a propaganda campaign apparently intended to explain improved Soviet-American relations to the public.

Readers and viewers have been given unprecedented exposure to articles, speeches and reports on how well relations are developing between the superpowers, and how good this is for all concerned.

Communist Party propagandists are elaborating this message in political lectures, telling their audiences that the Cold War period has been supplanted by "a new stage in international relations."

The official enthusiasm in these articles, broadcasts and lectures seem to be a clear signal to the public and to party activists that it is time for a change in attitudes toward "the leading imperialist power," as the United States was regularly described until recently.

So much publicly expressed enthusiasm also seems to indicate the extent to which the Soviet leadership is now committed to a better relationship with the United States.

The new propaganda campaign pops up in unexpected places. For example, one evening last week tens of millions of Soviet citizens watched the telecast of the Soviet-Czechoslovak hockey game in the current world championship competition. Between the first and second periods of the game, these millions of hockey fans saw a speech by the minister of health, Boris Petrovsky, who extolled the benefits of Soviet-American cooperation in medical research.

The weekly magazine *Za Rubezhom* (Abroad), which prints translations from the foreign press and original articles, devoted five full pages of this week's issue to "U.S.S.R.-U.S.A.: Expansion of Businesslike Cooperation for the Sake of Peace."

This unusual special section contained seven different articles pointing toward expanded Soviet-American trade.

At least one or another of the major Soviet daily newspapers has carried an article on Soviet-American relations almost daily for a week. In Sunday's *Pravda*, an article on cooperation in medical research revealed that the American heart specialist Dr. Michael DeBakey had performed a six-hour operation on the Soviet Union's top scientific official, M. V. Keldysh, president of the Soviet Academy of Science.

The operation was a success, *Pravda* said, and Keldysh is already back at work. News of this heart surgery may surprise many *Pravda* readers, who are not used to reading that their officials have turned to foreign specialists for health care. The Soviet Union has always boasted proudly of its own state medical system.

In the past week, *Pravda* has also carried long pieces on preparations for the joint Soviet-American space flight in 1975.

The press has given the most attention to trade with America. Articles on the subject cite recent agreements with U.S. concerns and other signs of progress. They also note that "some circles" in the United States are trying to frustrate further progress.

Political lecturers explain the improved relationship with America as a consequence of the Soviet Union's increased strength and influence. In the past, they say, the United States felt it could act "from a position of strength," but it now recognizes that the Soviet Union must be treated as an equal.

Several of the recent newspaper articles indicate official sensitivity to the charge that Soviet-American cooperation is essentially "one-sided" American aid to the Soviet Union. These articles insist that both countries are making an equal contribution to each other's knowledge and well-being.

There is no apparent sensitivity about helping the ideological enemy. Writing in *Pravda*, a deputy minister of foreign trade said that trade between the superpowers would "lead to higher living standards for the peoples of both countries."

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1973]

SOVIETS GET NEW, POSITIVE VIEW OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Robert G. Kaiser)

Moscow, May 1.—Soviet newspaper readers have a chance to read something unusual these days—long, detailed accounts of life in America which are friendly, fair and virtually devoid of propaganda.

The reports are appearing in the Communist Party newspaper *Pravda*, the country's principal paper with a circulation of 10 million and *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, the Young Communist League's paper, which is almost as well read. They were written by *Pravda*'s Washington correspondent, Boris Strelnikov, and Vasily Peskov, a well-known Soviet essayist and journalist who often writes about nature.

Strelnikov and Peskov spent six weeks touring America in a Gran Torino—"A Ford of perfect quality," they explain to their readers. They've written a dozen long articles on the trip, half of which have now appeared.

Their pieces reflect a deliberate policy decision by the Communist Party Central Committee and Soviet editors to improve America's image. Other capitalist countries are due to benefit from the same kind of friendly treatment, according to Soviet editors. This new approach to news about the "ideological enemy" reflects the government's new emphasis on international detente.

In the past Soviet coverage of the United States has concentrated on information that reflected badly on American society. In most cases, Soviet reports are factually accurate, but one-sided. They were often based on critical articles in the American press.

TOO GENEROUS

Strelnikov and Peskov have ignored that tradition with gay abandon. They write with exuberance and approval about many aspects of American life, and their criticisms are calm and reasonable. Some American residents of Moscow who have been reading the articles even find them a little too generous.

The most recent piece to appear describes American roadside restaurants with some awe. The speed of service amazes the authors, especially in a drive-in restaurant. The smiling, helpful waitress with her ever-present glass of ice water delights them. Col. Sanders' chicken in every corner of the country impresses them. And ketchup on every table is a fool's delight: "One of us even ate tomatoes with ketchup."

There is one drawback apart from the ketchup, nothing tastes very good. Foods produced "on the conveyor belt" are fresh, clean and filling. But bland. On the other hand, the efficiency of it all largely compensates for tastelessness, they concluded.

There are lots of good things to eat in America, the authors add, both in private homes and in better restaurants. Many specializing in all kinds of foreign foods.

But these restaurants aren't for everybody. Peskov and Strelnikov discovered. Traveling on a Soviet per diem allowances (these are notoriously small) they found the best restaurants beyond their reach "even in the interests of journalistic eurousity."

TRAFFIC JAMS

One article devoted to the automobile culture seemed a fair summary of its advantages and pains. The authors wrote respectfully about America's turnpikes, and all its roads. (There isn't a paved road that crosses the entire Soviet Union.) They note the comfort of American cars and the skill of American drivers. They also describe traffic accidents, traffic jams, and air pollution.

The country is grand and majestic, the two journalists write, but some industrial regions look like hell on earth. Americans live in their own houses, they acknowledge—a fact Soviet propagandists have generally withheld from their nation of overcrowded apartment-dwellers.

Americans are nuts for "packaging." They can't call it New Mexico and leave it at that; it has to be the "land of enchantment," too.

Advertising rules the land: "If it disappears one day Americans won't know what to do." Strelnikov's young son—a Washington resident—heard him whistling the March of the Toreadors from Carmen one day and said, "I know that song. It's from a soap advertisement."

These Soviet visitors found Americans to be "prudent, thrifty but not stingy." Most Americans didn't seem very curious to them. "We asked the questions during our conversations."

These Americans have one weakness: "They like to boast."

Senator FULBRIGHT. I don't think that is a very critical article. It seems to me directly contrary to the spirit of the Chief of the Polish Broadcasting Department of Radio Free Europe, which is just the opposite. He believes that détente, Communist good will, is nonsense. So I submit still there is very little evidence this is not a continuing cold war operation.

PARTIAL FORGERY OF MR. NOWAK'S LETTER

Mr. RUSH. I would like to say I understand the portion of Mr. Nowak's letter that you have just read was the forged part of what has been published in Poland. That was not in the letter that was stolen, but was inserted by the Poles or someone else, I understand. This is what we understand. The portion that you read was not part of the letter that he wrote but was forged when the letter was taken and printed in the Polish newspaper. This is my understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. Where did you get such an understanding?

Mr. RUSH. From Mr. Durkee.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you explain that?

Mr. DURKEE. Senator, I would like to for the record to thoroughly comment on the letters which you have read.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you saying they are forged?

Mr. DURKEE. No. Let me say what I was going to tell you. The only

letters that I know of appeared in a Warsaw newspaper. I have an affidavit from the man's desk that they were stolen from, that they were stolen from his desk. I also have an affidavit from my own employee that part of the letters that appeared in the Warsaw papers were forged.

With respect to any other letter that you quoted from, I have no record of it; nor do I have a copy of it.

The CHAIRMAN. I have copies here. The letter is addressed to two different men in Chicago, Ill.

Mr. DURKEE. Yes, sir; a newspaper editor, and they were stolen from his desk.

The CHAIRMAN. You said a Warsaw paper. These are Chicago papers.

Mr. DURKEE. The letters were stolen from the man's own desk and appeared in the Warsaw paper.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you saying the letters themselves are forged? He didn't write them?

Mr. DURKEE. I am saying one of the letters was forged.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't know whether they were stolen or not.

Mr. DURKEE. Yes; they were stolen.

The CHAIRMAN. I doubt that very much. These days we doubt everything we hear.

Mr. DURKEE. All I know is from the man who said they were stolen. They were stolen from his desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Who was the man who said they were stolen?

Mr. DURKEE. One of the officials of that newspaper.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his name?

Mr. DURKEE. I have his name on record.

The CHAIRMAN. Put his name in the record. If these are forgeries I think you ought to have the truth.

Mr. DURKEE. Yes; I will tell you what is forged and what is not forged.

The CHAIRMAN. Just part is forged?

Mr. DURKEE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The part you object to?

Mr. DURKEE. I don't know. I don't have them before me, but I will make it clear for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't believe you. We believe these are originals. I don't see any indication whatever. The whole tone of the letter is quite consistent, his comments about the politics here, his purpose in influencing the election. I didn't read it all. It is all here for you to read.

Mr. DURKEE. I very much appreciate having copies of the original letter.

The CHAIRMAN. I think to come at this date—we referred to these letters once before. I doubt that very seriously. Certainly you have an opportunity—

Mr. DURKEE. Thank you, I appreciate it very much.

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. To prove they are forgeries.

Mr. DURKEE. I am not alleging they are all forgeries.

The CHAIRMAN. Why was he reprimanded if they are forgeries?

Mr. DURKEE. He was reprimanded for the parts that are not forgeries.

The CHAIRMAN. This is getting too complicated.
Mr. DURKEE. He was not reprimanded for those that were forgeries.
[The information referred to follows:]

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD FROM WILLIAM P. DURKEE, PRESIDENT, FREE
EUROPE, INC., CONCERNING LETTERS OF MR. JAN NOWAK

On July 12, 1973, during a hearing of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington, D.C. on Senate Resolution 1914, J. William Fulbright, presiding, quoted from letters he said were written by Mr. Jan Nowak, Chief of the Polish Broadcasting Department of Radio Free Europe.

At the request of the President of Radio Free Europe, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee made available via the Department of State copies of letters sent to the Senate Committee. Radio Free Europe received the copies on Tuesday, 26 June 1973. The origin of the letters was not stated by the staff of the Committee in its transmittal of these copies. Copies of the letters are attached (*Exhibit A*).

Radio Free Europe, for the record, wishes to submit the following with respect to these letters:

(1) The attached article (*Exhibit B*) entitled "K: From Jan Nowak's File", appeared in the Warsaw daily newspaper *Zycie Warszawy*, No. 30, 4-5 February 1973. Also included in Exhibit B is a translation of the article. The translation was done by Radio Free Europe in Munich, Germany. It is a translation of a xerox copy of the original article.

Upon publication of the article in *Zycie Warszawy*, Radio Free Europe made inquiries of the addressee of the letters reproduced in that article, Mr. Antoni J. Leszczynski. The latter submitted a certified statement to us which states:

"To whom it may concern

"This is to certify that I read several private and personal letters addressed to me by Mr. Jan Nowak and reproduced in the Warsaw daily 'Zycie Warszawy' (No. 30 of 4-5 February, 1973).

"While some of them are authentic—one is undoubtedly and obviously a forgery.

ANTONI J. LESZCZYNSKI,
Editor, Polish Daily 'Zgoda'.

"SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN To before me by Antoni J. Leszczynski, this
16th day of March, 1973.

Notary Public".

A copy is attached (*Exhibit C*). Radio Free Europe retains the original.

Mr. Jan Nowak has submitted an affidavit, certifying that the letters to Mr. Leszczynski, dated 19 May and 13 June 1972 are copies of originals.

(2) A comparison of the letters submitted by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the letters printed in the *Zycie Warszawy* article shows the following:

(a) The letter dated 19 May 1972 to Mr. Antonio J. Leszczynski, 3635 N. Greenview Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60622, is identical in both cases.

(b) The letter of 13 June 1972 addressed to Mr. Antoni J. Leszczynski, 1201 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Ill. 60622, is reproduced in full with the signature and letter head in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee copy, but the *Zycie Warszawy* article does not contain the signature or letterhead.

(c) The purported letter of 29 September 1972 addressed to Mr. Redaktor Jan Krawiec was not reproduced in the *Zycie Warszawy* article, but clipped section of it were, making it appear as though such were part of the actual letter dated 13 June to Mr. Leszczynski.

Mr. Nowak has certified that he did not write the letter to Mr. Krawiec dated 29 September 1972, and that the said letter to Mr. Krawiec, 1201 Milwaukee Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60622 "on RFE stationery marked strictly confidential & personal, is a forgery." His Affidavit is attached (*Exhibit D*).

Mrs. Stanislaw Szulczewski, Mr. Nowak's Secretary, has submitted a sworn statement that Mr. Nowak did not dictate a letter to her addressed to Mr. Krawiec, dated 29 September 1972, and that her initials "are an obvious forgery." Mrs. Szulczewski's Affidavit is attached (*Exhibit E*).

Mr. Krawiec has stated that he did not receive the purported letter, of which a copy was received by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Mr. Krawiec's written statement is attached (*Exhibit F*).

[The exhibits referred to are in the committee files.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, I guess we are through. I better ask Dr. Eisenhower what his schedule is. Can you come back, or do you wish to proceed now? I will have to leave, but Senator Percy is quite competent to make the record.

Mr. RUSH. Could I have one more minute?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

COMMENT ON COEXISTENCE IN SOVIET MONTHLY,
"INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS"

Mr. RUSH. In connection with the article that you read I wanted to refer to the Soviet monthly, *International Affairs*, for March 1973 and just quote a few sentences from that. "Normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations by no means rules out principled ideological struggle, which is becoming increasingly important in the world arena. That is the profound meaning and the class essence of the Soviet Union's foreign policy line, which combines a policy of peaceful coexistence with implacable ideological struggle."

This is their comment on coexistence.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't see the point. I certainly don't think anybody here is wishing to give up our commitment to democracy. No one would expect them to deny their basic beliefs in how to organize society any more than we would. That is true with I guess pretty near every country, just as it is with different religions. It doesn't seem to me to be contrary to the idea they would like to have a détente. This is what I really thought President Nixon was for. I think I have been, in both this instance and China, in complete agreement, but I would think Mr. Nowak thinks it is nonsense. That is the only point.

Thank you very much.

HEARING PROCEDURE

Dr. Eisenhower, we would like to consult with you. What is your convenience.

Mr. EISENHOWER. I understand the committee might meet this afternoon?

The CHAIRMAN. I am in charge on the floor, but that doesn't mean the committee can't meet, especially if Senator Percy——

Senator PERCY. Regretfully I did not know we might be meeting this afternoon and I have a string of appointments from two o'clock to 3:45, and it would be very difficult to cancel them all. I would like to continue now, Dr. Eisenhower.

The CHAIRMAN. You are perfectly free to do that.

Senator PERCY. Dr. Eisenhower, since I have read your statement, and I presume the rest of the committee has read your statement, we could simply incorporate it in the record unless you would like to give it. If you give it before Senator Fulbright leaves, he may wish to pose a few questions to you; then Senator Javits and I have questions.

Senator JAVITS. I will waive any questions myself. I think we ought to get Dr. Eisenhower out, unless something very urgent occurs to me.

The CHAIRMAN. I yield to you if you wish to proceed in that way.

Senator PERCY. I have five questions. If you would like to read your statement, Dr. Eisenhower, I have time to hear the statement and still get the questions in before I have to leave. I leave it to your pleasure.

**STATEMENT OF MILTON EISENHOWER, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENTIAL
STUDY COMMISSION ON INTERNATIONAL RADIO BROADCASTING;
ACCOMPANIED BY EDWARD W. BARRETT, JOHN A. GRONOUSKI,
AND EDMUND A. GULLION**

Mr. EISENHOWER. Supposing instead of my reading a statement, since you have it before you and have it for the record, I just summarize a couple of points.

Senator PERCY. That would be fine.

Mr. EISENHOWER. On the basis of three trips I have made to the Soviet Union as well as the 6 months that I have put in on this study, I am absolutely convinced that one of the main incentives on the part of the Soviet Union and the Eastern European nations now working toward détente is the consequence of their peoples gradually, over a period of years, learning that life in the West is different from what it is in their countries, and they have reached the conclusion that their conditions need not be inevitable. This is one of the major incentives for their working for arms reduction, trade relations, better relations in general, in order that they can reorder the priorities of production to contribute to human well-being within their countries.

FINANCING OF STATIONS

The second point I want to make very strongly has to do with the financing of the stations because in our conferences early in our studies with Senators and Congressmen we found this to be a major issue. I wish we could have come up with a formula under which Europe paid at least 50 percent of the cost. Of course, you understand we were not authorized to negotiate with the governments of Europe to see whether they would do this, but we talked with knowledgeable persons in Europe. We came firmly to the conclusion that—drawing on the experience not only in NATO but in UNESCO, where publications are edited and reedited, in order to get a consensus, until they become bland and almost meaningless—in the rapid fire business of daily broadcasting where you want to get the news to the people fast, accurately, and backed by research findings, it would simply, in our judgment, practically kill the stations if they had to seek consensus on everything they were going to say.

Third, and by the way on this—

Senator PERCY. On that point, wouldn't it be possible to find a way for them to contribute to operating expenses, but, as a major controlling stockholder, doesn't have to consult on everything he does with the minority stockholders, have an operating agreement in which we would assume responsibility for the programing and they would contribute to the operation simply because they have a general confidence and faith that the broadcasting will continue to be responsible and useful.

Mr. EISENHOWER. Senator Percy, if it becomes the policy of the U.S. Government that these stations are going to be continued until there is a free flow of information across national boundaries, then I think the U.S. Government is in a position to try every possible method to achieve financial help without bringing about the disastrous results that I have indicated.

But as things stand at the moment, when we don't know that and we saw, as we talked to knowledgeable people in Europe, seeking help, we feared, as I have indicated, what the consequences would be.

LARGER ISSUE IN WHICH RADIOS' FINANCING IS CAUGHT

Now, there is one personal statement which I have not cleared with my associates who have worked with me. Here is Mr. Barrett, Ambassador Gronouski, and Ambassador Gullion. In my visits with a number of Senators I gained the impression that the problem of financing the two radios is now caught in a much larger issue. Many Senators and many of us in private life are chagrined, even angry, by failure of the European nations to meet fully their obligations in support of Western security.

Only one nation in Europe has lived up to its commitments. The United States continues to carry a disproportionate share of the cost even at a time when Europe can afford to do more. Hence many favored immediate and unilateral reduction of our European expenditures. I would feel the same if it were not for my earnest hope that in the military reduction talks now underway we can achieve agreement for reductions by all Western and Eastern European powers. If that happy result is achieved I would hope that by negotiation we of the United States could have a higher percentage reduction than most of the European nations and this then would give us a more equitable situation. It is an unhappy circumstance to have the problem of the radios involved in this large issue.

The statement goes on but those were the points that I wanted to have an opportunity to make before your questions, sir.

[The full statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF MILTON S. EISENHOWER

Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee:

I am Milton S. Eisenhower, President Emeritus of The Johns Hopkins University, and Chairman of the President's Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting. My previous activities which may have some bearing on the current assignment include the post of Associate Director of War Information during World War II, first Chairman of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, and membership on the Executive Committee of UNESCO in Paris—a major purpose of the organization being to promote the free flow of information among the peoples of the world, regardless of national boundaries.

With me are my fellow Commissioners: Edward Barrett, Director of the Communications Institute, Academy for Educational Development, and previously Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs at a time the Voice of America was under his general supervision; John A. Gronouski, Dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs and formerly Ambassador to Poland where he regularly received the broadcasts of Radio Free Europe; Edmund A. Gullion, Dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, formerly a Foreign Service Career Minister, Ambassador to the Congo and Deputy Director of the United States Disarmament Administration, and John P. Roche, Professor of Politics, Brandeis University, formerly Special Consultant to the President of the United States.

My opening statement will be fairly brief.

In our discussions with Senators and Representatives at the outset of our study of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty we found that four questions were constantly raised:

Are the radios a positive encouragement or a deterrent to detente?

If the radios are continued, what Federal agency should receive appropriations and then make allocations to the two private radio corporations?

How can all concerned be assured that these private stations—operating essentially as a free press which is necessary to their maintaining credibility in listening areas—operate in a manner not inconsistent with United States foreign policy?

Should not European countries pay a substantial part of the cost of operating the stations?

The five of us respect the views of those who feel that the radios are irritants to the governments of the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries, and, hence, not harmonious with the spirit of detente which now seems evident. We surely applaud every small or major step taken to reduce friction between the two great power centers of the world. However, on the basis of trips several of us have made to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and from the six-month study we recently completed, we are convinced that by the dissemination of factual information and research-backed interpretations to the peoples of the six countries concerned, we enhance progress toward detente. Stated differently, we would fear a situation in which the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe knew only what their rigidly-controlled mass media permitted them to know. A misinformed or partially-informed people could be pawns in the hands of party and governmental leaders. Persons in possession of the facts about world and internal conditions, actions, and aims, on the other hand, do have an influence on leaders, even of dictatorial regimes.

I would go so far as to assert this: A major motivation of the Soviet Union in developing better relations with the United States and other Western nations is a response to the expressed desire of her people for higher standards of living, a consuming desire that has gradually developed from their knowledge that human welfare elsewhere is better served and advanced, and that their own current condition need not be inevitable or should not be ignored. Hence, the Soviet Union seeks better trade relations and agreements in the political and military areas which will permit her to emphasize more than ever before production which improves personal well-being.

As to the next two questions, we believe we have recommended a simple and inexpensive form of Federal organization which can, if the radios are continued, receive Federal appropriations, make allocations to the private corporations, see to it that funds are legally and responsibly used, and—while respecting the independence of the stations in transmitting news and interpretations, both external and internal, and thus maintaining unprecedented credibility—assure the Congress and the people that broadcasts are not inconsistent with American foreign policy. The details of this are set forth in the report which the members of the Committee have, so I shall not deal with them unless you wish my colleagues and me to discuss this phase of the study after I have dealt with the last of the four points I have mentioned.

The members of the Study Commission feel that we should, through the official channels of our government, urge European nations to begin providing either public or private funds, possibly both, in support of some aspects of the radios' operations. Efforts in this regard can begin and become effective if and when it is known that the radios will be continued until there is, as promised in the Declaration of Human Rights and the Constitution of UNESCO, a free flow of information across national boundaries—that information reaching the peoples of one power center of the world is not filtered through systems of control that harmfully distort or withhold the facts. Efforts to obtain financial help should be, first, in support of the indispensable and accurate research of the two stations, this research costing about \$3.5 million a year. We should also seek both foreign and domestic private and public funds to help rebuild the transmitting facilities of the stations, for they are rapidly becoming obsolete, overpowered by scores of other stations. This cost will be large, perhaps \$30 million.

But we do not favor foreign financial help in support of *daily broadcasting*. United States experiences in many international organizations demonstrate how time-consuming it is to get agreement in a multi-national effort. In the

editorial field, such as in preparing UNESCO publications, texts may be edited and re-edited until they meet the objections of all, and the final result may be bland and meaningless. In the rapid-fire task of daily broadcasting, multinational control with the inevitable delays and compromises would be fatal. Indeed, a great strength of RFE and RL is that they usually reach their audiences with both world and internal news and interpretations before the centralized censoring bureaucracy has released the governmentally sanitized versions. This causes increased listenership and enhances credibility for RFE and RL. Furthermore, despite all the criticism of the United States heard abroad, I am convinced, from three personal visits to the Soviet Union, that our country is more highly respected by the listeners than is any other nation. Hosts of them are grateful to us for helping them learn about the actual conditions that affect personal well-being and international relationships.

In conclusion, I wish to make a personal statement which I have not checked with my colleagues. In my visits with a number of Senators, I gained the impression that the problem of financing the two radios is caught in a much larger issue. Many Senators and many of us in private life are chagrined, even angry, by the failure of the European nations to meet fully their obligations in support of Western security. Only one nation in Europe has lived up to its commitments. The United States continues to carry a disproportionate share of the cost, even at a time when Europe can afford to do more. Hence many favor an immediate and unilateral reduction of our European expenditures. I would feel the same were it not for my earnest hope that in the military-force-reduction talks we can achieve agreement for reductions by all Western and Eastern powers. If that happy result is achieved, I would hope that reductions by the United States would be greater percentage-wise than those made by most European governments. We would then have a more equitable situation.

It is an unhappy circumstance to have the problems of the radios involved in this larger issue. The Soviet Union and nations within her hegemony, even in working for detente, have made clear their intention to intensify the ideological struggle. They speak to the world in more than four thousand program hours each week—in 84 languages by Soviet Moscow alone. Of this total, 250 program hours a week are beamed to North America in English and a variety of foreign languages used by ethnic groups in the United States; this seems wasteful, since our free press carries nearly everything the Soviet Union and her satellites say or do.

All of the Western powers combined, speak to the world, including some programs to the Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union, about 4,200 programs hours a week. Only RFE and RL are beamed exclusively to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, for a total, respectively, of 566 and 579 program hours a week. Essential as are the Voice of America, BBC, French and other radios which present the official views of their governments, there can be no doubt that in this complex of broadcasting, RFE and RL are unique, and in my view the most effective in reaching the power center with which the United States must find accommodation.

An informed people, I am convinced, will work for that accommodation, for lasting detente. The cost of the radios is about one-third of one percent of other United States costs in Europe. If an informed people succeed in inspiring their governments to enter into mutual force reductions, the radios each year could pay for themselves, perhaps a hundredfold.

In the report submitted to you, you will find fourteen examples of the effectiveness of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty in reaching listeners with the type of information that surely is a cumulative inducement to detente. These were selected from hundreds that could be cited. I commend them to you. They are on pages 30 to 36 of our report.

COMMENDATION OF COMMISSION REPORT

Senator PERCY. Thank you, Dr. Eisenhower. I do want to express deep appreciation to you and members of the Commission and staff for what I consider to be an exceptionally good report. It answers many questions I had and some very good questions that Senator Fulbright has raised.

PRESIDENT'S INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING STUDY

I wonder if you could share with us some of the doubts you had as you went along. I think you told me when you started this study that you went into it with an open mind, without prejudice of any kind. You were to seek the truth and call the shots as you saw them.

Did you have any direction at all from the President as to what you should come up with, or did he just tell you to do the best job you could of studying the situation and making recommendations?

Mr. EISENHOWER. We had no instructions from the President other than his letter which is printed in the report and in which he asked us to consider the relation of the operation of the radios to U.S. foreign policy and if we found the answer to that to be affirmative that we were then to study how to organize—how do you get public money into private corporations and maintain the independence of the stations but still see to it they live within American foreign policy. You asked me whether we had any doubts, yes.

RESOLUTIONS OF DOUBTS CONCERNING RADIOS

Senator PERCY. What were the doubts and how did you resolve the doubts and achieve a unanimous report?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I had developed some doubts in 1959 when I was in the Soviet Union and in Poland with then Vice President Nixon which gave me the feeling that at that time the radios were dealing in polemics and even making personal attacks on certain leaders. Therefore, when we went to Europe—to Munich, we were exceedingly careful to discuss this problem not only with the Americans who have policy and program charge of the stations but we talked with those who do the actual broadcasting—the people in charge of each desk. We became satisfied that these broadcasts today are factual, backed up by solid research, free of polemics, free of personal attacks. Therefore, my doubt was completely removed.

I think, sir, this is the only doubt I had when I started the study. But I do assure you that all five of us made up our minds if we have had any preconceptions about this when we undertook the study, we knew we had to free our minds of those preconceptions and do an objective job.

Senator PERCY. I wonder if your colleagues would care to comment on any doubts they may have had.

Mr. BARRETT. Edward Barrett. When I was back last summer I received a telephone call saying that the radios were being criticized on the Hill as a cold war relic, et cetera, and I was asked if I would sign a statement endorsing continuation of the radios. I said I was not prepared to do so. When I had been an Assistant Secretary of State, I had known all about it, but I was not up to date. What had been the cold war had changed considerably. For all I knew they might be a relic of the cold war and maybe should be discontinued.

Subsequently, I received another call saying a statement had been proposed by a committee organized by George Ball stating that the stations should not be killed precipitately, without a thorough investigation. I said I would be happy to sign that one. It was some months later, somewhat to my surprise, that I was appointed to the Commission, and I went in with a series of questions in my mind: Should

the stations indeed be continued in view of the détente atmosphere? Should they be changed? Should they perhaps be merged with the Voice of America? As our chairman knows, I raised countless questions during these discussions. I am sure I delayed the deliberations considerably. But the final opinions I reached are reflected in this report.

Senator PERCY. Thank you.

Mr. GULLION. My name is Edmund Gullion, I am dean of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University, a former Ambassador and Foreign Service officer, retired.

My feeling about the stations was somewhat similar to that expressed just now by my colleague, Mr. Barrett. I also joined the Ball Committee and shared in the view that the stations should not be terminated precipitously. Perhaps I had somewhat less reserves than Mr. Barrett as expressed with respect to the necessity of the stations continuation. I did have considerable reservations, though, with respect to the evolution of the message. For example, I had never had occasion to inform myself with respect to the role of RFE at the time of the Hungarian uprising. I was aware that the station Radio Liberty had formerly been called Radio Liberation and in 1963 was called Radio Liberty. I wondered whether that name connoted a change in philosophy, how and how much. Then I had not so much doubts as lack of information, with respect to just what the role of the stations were in relation between the United States, the nations within the Soviet hegemony and within the Soviet Union itself.

RESOLUTION OF RESERVATIONS CONCERNING RADIOS

My other reservations were rather procedural. They stem from the fundamental query as to how the party line was maintained and how the particular scripts were reviewed to protect against aberrations and to keep them from straying into areas manifestly at variance with the U.S. foreign policy, either too complacent or too provocative and how these stations really functioned. I did have some idea or hope that they could be made more European in character and that more funding could be procured from Europe.

During our Commission sessions, and particularly during our visit to Europe, we had occasion to understand how guidance was exercised, how guidelines were produced and how their execution was monitored. My feelings and worries about this aspect were dispelled. I hoped then and I still hope that more effort could be made with respect to procurement of European funding, but I participated in some of the sessions with some of the people in Europe and I realized that the situation is, as our chairman, Mr. Eisenhower stated it, not for the near future, very hopeful, although it is apparent there might be some possibilities for more funding in support of the research operations and perhaps on the technical side.

Senator PERCY. Ambassador Gronouski, we certainly welcome you. Good to see you.

Mr. GRONOUSKI. Good to see you. John Gronouski, dean of the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas, Austin.

I guess I entered the deliberations of the committee with fewer doubts than most of my colleagues, and that is probably because I had

more recent and detailed experience as Ambassador to Poland in evaluating the work on a continuing basis over almost a 3-year period of Radio Free Europe in one country, Poland. I think that I should note that in September of 1971 I expressed myself as clearly as I could on this matter in testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

I felt then as I feel now that one who has experienced the impact of Radio Free Europe in the dissemination of news within the country in as much detail as I did in Poland, comes away with a strong feeling for the fundamental value of the radios in impacting on public opinion in the direction of détente between East and West.

Senator PERCY. Thank you very much. Those are helpful statements.

HAVE IMPEDIMENTS TO FREE FLOW OF INFORMATION BEEN REDUCED?

I would like to ask whether in the recent period of improved East-West relations there has been any reduction in government impediments to the free flow of information within the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. I note that Soviet TV is requesting an interview with me during the Brezhnev visit, and I presume they will be interviewing a great many of us.

NBC has been asked to coordinate coverage of the visit and it appears there is to be an effort to provide a good deal of coverage in the Soviet Union. Have you seen a trend toward more coverage?

Mr. EISENHOWER. I think the executive heads of the two radios can answer better than I. May I remind you just before Chairman Khrushchev made his visit to this country in the Eisenhower administration that the press—the mass media of the Soviet Union took on a much friendlier attitude in an apparent move to justify the visit that Chairman Khrushchev was making to this country. I, therefore, am not terribly surprised by the current change in tone of the Communist mass media. I had not read the article that Senator Fulbright quoted, that for a temporary period at least there seems to be a friendlier attitude, thus justifying the visit.

Senator JAVITS. Would the Senator yield for one question?

Senator PERCY. Yes.

NECESSITY OF MAINTAINING RADIOS UNTIL INFORMATION FLOWS FREELY

Senator JAVITS. Dr. Eisenhower, before I go I wanted to ask you one question. Basic to the whole issue, is there really any likelihood that fundamental differences will be overcome until we get a relatively comparable degree of openness in their society? We have troubles about openness ourselves, secrecy, Watergates, and other things. Isn't it a fact that before you can really talk about dismantling this kind of machinery that you are testifying to, there must be a relatively comparable degree of openness in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and until they are operating in the light of day, you simply have to, by one way or another, maintain your facilities.

Mr. EISENHOWER. I think that is the whole issue. When there is a free flow of information across national boundaries, there will be absolutely no reason for these radios to operate. These radios now operate as a surrogate free press, for the people of the five Eastern

European countries and the Soviet Union, and since everything that is disseminated by any method within these countries has to go through the highly bureaucratized censorship and other information control systems, if it changes today it is because they officially decided to change it, and if it changes back tomorrow it will be because that was the decision of the Communist Party as carried out by the Communist government. So, of course, that is the issue.

We have an open society. Theirs is a closed society. Whenever there is a free flow the problem is settled.

Senator JAVITS. Thank you very much.

Senator PERCY. I would like to yield to Senator Fulbright.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate that. I do have to go to the policy committee that is meeting at 12:30.

MR. KHRUSHCHEV'S AND MR. BREZHNEV'S VISITS

Mr. Eisenhower, I deeply regret I do have to go because I always like to exchange views with you. Your comment about Mr. Khrushchev's visit stimulated some memories of mine because I always felt that your brother was proceeding along the same lines as this President until the very unfortunate incident, for which I do not hold him responsible at all, occurred, the U-2 incident. I thought the effect of your brother's taking Khrushchev up to Camp David was most beneficial and I always felt the country missed a great opportunity that that didn't go on to fruition and President Eisenhower go to Moscow as planned and all that. That is part of history.

You have stimulated it by your reference to Khrushchev's visit and how these things happen. I don't think that there wasn't some substance to his desire to do what I think Brezhnev hopes he can do, whether we rebuff it or reject it. I hope we do not. I would do anything I can to see that we reciprocate in some small way their gestures of conciliation, as has been reported in the press.

PROLIFERATION OF FOREIGN BROADCASTING QUESTIONED

But in any case, I certainly respect your views about it, as I do Ambassador Gronouski's. However, there is a tendency to view all of these activities as disassociated from all other activities. You heard me say, I believe, in the beginning, that we will be spending on foreign broadcasts \$133 million, all purely American projects, including the Armed Forces, which is the smallest of the three, of course.

On page 46 of your Study Commission report, there is a description of what is called the revolution in international broadcasting, referring to the vast expansion in the number and power of international broadcasts of all sorts. It then says if a modernization of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is not undertaken, and I quote, "the intended audiences will find it increasingly difficult to hear their broadcasts." It seems to me in view of our enormous expenditure—I dare say much more than the Russians spend. I can't imagine them being foolish enough to spend \$133 million or the equivalent on such things as Voice of America. What you have here is this vast amount of hours. In addition, as your report points out, you have an expansion of BBC. All of these governments have their radios.

Are we to assume that the Germans, French, Italians, and British broadcasts are not reasonably consistent with ours in the presence of the truth? Are we the only people, not only including the Russians but all other people, who have any access to the truth and who have a reasonable amount of the truth in their broadcasts. You yourself pointed out the tremendous growth of others. Competing, you say. Therefore, you say, give us better facilities so we can outcompete them. Leaving out consideration \$56 million of VOA—We put a modern and very powerful station a year or 2 ago in Kavala, Greece, which will reach practically all of the Soviet Union, and we are proposing to put a new one in Korea that will reach certainly all of the rest of it. We turned it down temporarily. I don't know whether it will stick or not. Isn't there ever a point at which enough is enough? Isn't it enough? It is like this proliferation of nuclear weapons. Do we have to kill them 50 times? Isn't it enough with VOA, plus all of the armed services? Don't you think that is enough? Do they have to have three times the repetition solely from America now and we count nothing the BBC does, which really in all deference has had a better reputation over the years for objectivity than any other national program? It did during the war. That is only a thought I have and I respect your judgment. If we had nothing else but RFE and RL and they were the only way to project, I think I would agree with you. That is all you were commissioned to study.

SOVIET SPENDING ON JAMMING

Mr. EISENHOWER. You have raised two different points. You expressed doubts that the Soviet Union is spending as much as we are. Let me assure you that they are spending many times as much, merely on jamming.

The CHAIRMAN. What is your proof?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Just on jamming as we are spending on broadcasting.

The CHAIRMAN. But jamming is an entirely different problem. That only indicates just how irritating the broadcasting is to them and our thesis that this is a cold war program. You fortify the belief that it is a cold war relic.

Mr. EISENHOWER. It is part of their effort to have monopolistic control of the information that reaches their people and, therefore, my answer is relevant.

The CHAIRMAN. Do they jam everybody? Do they jam BBC and the French and Italians?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Only at times depending on what the broadcasts are.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY AND GOVERNMENT-OWNED RADIOS

On your second question. As you well know, there is a distinct difference between these two privately operated radios which are operating as a free press, as contrasted to all of the governmentally owned and operated radios in the world. If BBC and French radio and Italian and our own Voice of America could operate as a free press reporting on their domestic affairs—which are tremendously important, just

as they bring in outside information with interpretation, there would be no use for these radios. But these are the only two that are doing the particular job we are talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, if this were directly under State Department I can't imagine they would have a man who thinks that détente and conciliation with Russia under this regime is nonsense, as Mr. Nowak said. I can't believe they would say they are independent and don't have to be guided. I don't think they are very independent, and I think the BBC and the other radios are quite competent to take the ordinary news. In addition we still have Voice of America to put out all of the propaganda we want. It finally comes down, as I say, and I won't pursue it any longer, to the fact that \$133 million seems too much of a good thing.

ARMED FORCES NETWORK

Senator PERCY. Out of that \$133 million are you including the \$27 million for the Armed Forces network?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator PERCY. I wonder if that should be considered part of our international radio broadcasting? That is strictly to our own forces and is not part of this program at all.

The CHAIRMAN. When you say "strictly," it is not beamed to Russia, but it surrounds Russia. A big part of it is in Germany and I am quite sure it is available. You can hear these broadcasts. I have heard them myself in various places around the world.

Senator PERCY. Isn't it designed essentially for our own Armed Forces?

REFUGEES RUNNING RADIOS

The CHAIRMAN. I was indicating how much and how far we go in this foreign broadcasting outside of the United States. Before you came in I explained the figures that we have--\$133 million on broadcasts outside of our country, carrying what they say is facts and news. The armed services network, I assume, carries as near facts and news as any because their personnel is not made up primarily of refugees from Eastern Europe. We are familiar with the refugees. I have the greatest sympathy for them. We used to have one on this committee who felt so strongly about Tito he couldn't stand that we would have anything to do with Tito. I sympathized with him. I sympathize with those who have had these experiences. I am sure I would feel the same if I had been hounded out of one of those countries. I don't criticize him, but I think we ought to face what are the facts. I think a big percentage of the people running these are refugees from Eastern Europe. It is true they speak the language, but they also have their biases, which is not necessarily and always coincident with the interest of the United States.

U.S. POSITION IS BEING PROJECTED AND MUST BE

Senator JAVITS. I thoroughly disagree with the chairman on this point and for this reason. It is the U.S. position which is being projected, and it must be. Otherwise you are not going to have real détente unless the Russian public understands what is occurring in the world and what the United States stands for.

HOW RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY DIFFER FROM
VOICE OF AMERICA

Senator PERCY. Thank you for your valuable contribution. My next question relates directly to what the chairman asked about in connection with Voice of America. How do Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty differ from Voice of America? What service do they provide that Voice of America simply can't provide?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Voice of America obviously is presenting the official viewpoint of the U.S. Government. I think that is a valuable to do. In the receiving countries I rather suspect that some of the Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty listeners in the countries we are talking about, may accept the broadcasts with tongue in cheek simply because they know their own governments often mislead them. I have no evidence on that. That is a suspicion. But the difference here is, as Secretary Rush said, and as I have said in the formal statement I submitted to you, this is much more than bringing the news and interpretation from the outside world into the Soviet Union and the five Eastern European countries. Its internal reporting and cross-reporting are highly important. This information is received by monitoring local broadcasts, by taking 175 local newspapers, by painstaking research and even by information sent out by American and other correspondents.

The radios know pretty much about what is going on, and news of these events is spread by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty broadcasts.

For example, when the Fiat plant was being erected in the Soviet Union, they invited some of the Communist trade unionists from Italy to visit the plant. When Dido, who was the head of the delegation, went back to Italy he was very critical of the fact that Soviet labor has no voice in making policy in anything; and he wrote his criticism with some descriptive language. This was taken back to the people there by Radio Liberty.

They would never have known that labor in Italy was any different. This kind of reporting is done only by Radio Liberty but also may be reported by Radio Free Europe, if it is something of general interest.

I had a personal experience which is now reported in our report. When I spent a full month in the Soviet Union covering a good deal of territory, people kept saying to me that we were the imperialist power in the Middle East. The reason for this was that every time we gave economic or military aid to Israel it was splashed in all of the media, but what the people didn't know, most of them, was that the Soviet Union had put 5½, perhaps as much as 6 billion rubles into the Arab countries, particularly into Egypt.

Radio Liberty has done its best to reach the people, free of polemics and in an expository style, with the full truth, and the more this is understood the more the people over there realize that we are not the imperialistic power in the Middle East. These things go on day after day.

In the report, by the way, Senator, are 14 examples of the type of effectiveness of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe broadcasts, which we think contributes to détente; and continuation will contribute to détente. These 14 examples were selected from hundreds that we put aside. Sheer volume didn't permit us to give more.

SIGNIFICANCE TO SOVIET AND EASTERN EUROPEAN PEOPLE OF RADIOS'
BROADCASTS

Senator PERCY. Could you comment on the significance that people in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union place on receiving broadcasts from Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty?

Mr. EISENHOWER. Yes, sir, I think I would like to ask some of my colleagues to respond to this too. A high percentage of the letters that Radio Free Europe receives from Poland, for example, are from young people, up to say 25 years of age; and almost invariably those letters indicate that they listened with regularity and that this is where they are getting facts.

In fact, the radio is so acceptable in Poland that Warsaw I, II, and III are their official stations but they call Radio Free Europe, Warsaw IV. I think that the study by the Research Service of the Library of Congress and studies made by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty indicate that they do have a vast audience. One of the most impressive evidences was how high their listening audience developed in Czechoslovakia and then declined sharply when Dubcek restored freedom of the press.

Listenership was cut nearly in two and has been built back up now that they have restored censorship.

Ambassador Gronouski, would you like to add to this?

Mr. GRONOUSKI. I should observe that, again going back to my own personal experience in Poland, and that is primarily the place where I have had experience with RFE, I traveled during my almost 3 years there throughout the country; and there wasn't a day that went by that I didn't have brought to my attention by a Polish national that they had gotten this bit of news or that bit of news or that kind of information from Radio Free Europe. It was just absolutely overwhelming and I might note, by the way, that during the student uprising in January 1968, 1 of the 13 points the students made and printed on a banner that was hung across the Polytechnic in Warsaw and handed out in handbills, the fifth point of the 13 points was the observation that, it is unfortunate we must get the news of what students are doing in this country from Radio Free Europe. It was only because of the dissemination by RFE of news on student affairs throughout the country during that period that Polish radio and TV picked it up at all.

When I went to the ski resorts or wherever I went, I talked to private citizens; and wherever I went I realized that Radio Free Europe was having a great impact on those people not specifically in telling—this is the point I wish I could get across to Mr. Fulbright—not in terms of what is happening in Germany or England or the Mideast, but in terms of what is happening in Poland.

This is the critical element of Radio Free Europe and these two radios generally—that they open up a dialog within the country about that country, and in opening up that dialog and in effect forcing the press and other media of that country to disseminate often embarrassing information they create a climate where the people of the country have some impact on the policies of the leaders of that country. If we believe in the essence of a democratic system, we must recognize that this kind of people involvement in the affairs of a nation that only comes about in Eastern Europe through the develop-

ment of information of the kind that RFE provides—this kind of personal involvement by the people in the affairs of the nation tends to ameliorate the harshness of the programs of that nation.

Senator PERCY. Your statement is very helpful.

VALUE OF RADIOS: SAMIZDAT

Mr. EISENHOWER. Ambassador Gullion would like to make a statement.

Mr. GULLION. I would simply like to refer to *samizdat*, the phenomenon of self-publication, which I think may have been growing all along but which now has reached a cumulative point within the Soviet, where it seems to me to have added new dimensions to the value of Radio Liberty and also of Radio Free Europe. The stations accumulate a great deal of this material circulating through the Soviet Union. *Samizdat* is broadcast back and amplified achieving a great deal wider penetration than it would otherwise have. In my view this whole RFE/RL operation is not simply an extra in American foreign policy; it's really the staff of life essential to the spiritual and intellectual nourishment of millions and millions of people. We should not abandon them.

SOVIET JAMMING

Senator PERCY. Dr. Eisenhower, I would like to ask if I could put one more question to you and have it answered for the record. How much money is spent for jamming? How effective is the jamming, what is your analysis as to why the Soviet Union exerts such an effort in jamming and whether you feel over a period of time they might lessen jamming as they realize either the futility of it or the desirability of people to having more information.

Mr. EISENHOWER. I will submit that in writing.
[The information referred to follows:]

STATEMENT BY DR. MILTON S. EISENHOWER ON SOVIET AND EASTERN
EUROPEAN JAMMING

COST OF JAMMING

I am informed by the Department of State that some estimates of the annual cost of jamming by the Soviet Union and some East European states have run close to \$200 million—one as high as \$300 million. However, it is generally agreed that no close estimate is possible because of many variables or unknowns—the number of high-powered transmitters actually in use, the number of small, so-called “ground-wave” jammers which are effective over short distances in metropolitan areas, the size and pay-levels of operating staff, etc.

Nevertheless, I am informed that radio engineers close to the problem are quite sure that total jamming costs run higher than the cost of U.S. international broadcasting—that is, of the Voice of America, RFE and Radio Liberty. In terms of the amount of U.S. broadcasting against which the jamming is directed—a small proportion of the total VOA output, somewhat more than half of RFE broadcasts, and all of Radio Liberty—the jamming effort would cost considerably more. In terms of the proportion of the Soviet Union's Gross National Product put into this effort, it is again higher.

As one yardstick of dollar cost, I note that Mr. Richard Helms, former Director of the CIA, told this Committee last February 5 that the cost to the Soviet Union of jamming RFE was “more than twice what RFE costs,” this would make it upward of \$50 millions.

As another way of measuring the effort, engineers conversant with jamming point out that it requires from three to six large long-distance transmitters to jam a single broadcast transmitter to any real effect, and that for greater

effectiveness these have to be supplemented by at least one ground-wave jammer in each population center—that is, 7 or more even in a small country like Czechoslovakia.

EXTENT OF JAMMING

The Soviet Union jams Radio Liberty, as it has since the station first went on the air. It currently jams all Voice of America broadcasts to the Soviet Union except those in the Baltic languages.

The Bulgarian broadcasts of both Radio Free Europe and VOA are jammed. Czechoslovak and Polish broadcasts of RFE are jammed. Jamming of Polish broadcasts stopped in 1956, after the Poznan riots and Golumka's accession to power; it was resumed by degrees after the 1970 Baltic Coast demonstrations. In Czechoslovakia jamming completely stopped in the late stages of the 1968 "Prague Spring," but was resumed after the Warsaw Pact invasion; it is as heavy today as at any time in the past.

Hungary gave up jamming in 1964, and Romania in 1963.

EFFECTIVENESS

There is no question but that jamming discourages regular listening by many people who would otherwise be glad to receive information from the stations concerned. Conversely, it is almost impossible for jammers to deprive a determined listener from hearing a given broadcaster if he is willing to wait for the most favorable time of day, to test out various frequencies until he finds the one least jammed in his locale, or if necessary to go out to the suburbs or the country to escape the concentrated jamming in metropolitan areas.

Fortunately, however, it is not generally that difficult. Radio Liberty (and of course the Voice of America) have millions of listeners in the Soviet Union. And Radio Free Europe has millions also in its listening areas—in the jammed areas as well as the unjammed.

The case of RFE is interesting. In Hungary it is entirely unjammed, and its most recent audience studies indicate a listenership of 53% of the population over age 14. In Czechoslovakia, where RFE is most heavily jammed, it still maintains a listenership of 35% of those over 14. However, in terms of frequent listenership, there is a wider disparity—undoubtedly due to the difficulty of listening. In Hungary, three out of five of those who listen to RFE at all are frequent listeners—that is, they tune in daily or several times a week. But in Czechoslovakia, about one out of three RFE listeners tunes in frequently. (Even so, I might add, this means a frequent listenership in Czechoslovakia of one-and-a-third millions, in a country with a considerably smaller population than California or New York.)

REASON FOR THE JAMMING EFFORT

I have been asked to analyze why the Soviet Union (and I might add, some East European countries) exert such an effort to blot out most American-sponsored broadcasts. I think Leonid Brezhnev gave the reason for that very succinctly in his speech to the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee two months ago, on April 26. As quoted by *Pravda*, Mr. Brezhnev said that "favorable conditions have been created in the development of peaceful collaboration among the countries of Europe." But he also said:

"The most important trend in the foreign-policy work of the Soviet Communist Party is the struggle to strengthen the positions of world socialism . . ."

And the *Pravda* report added:

"The Plenum . . . devoted attention to the necessity for constant vigilance and readiness to give a rebuff to the intrigues of the aggressive imperialist circles, and for consistent struggle against reactionary ideology propaganda . . ."

What the Soviet program calls for—as they make clear not only by jamming but by close control of all media, of travel, and even of publication of Soviet works abroad which might leak back into the country—is as airtight a monopoly as possible over what goes into the minds of their citizens and, so far as their powers of persuasion go, the citizens of their allies. The Romanian and Hungarian leaderships apparently feel that they can control the situation sufficiently by shaping the internal flow of information, and accept the handicap of unjammed information from outside rather than accentuate its importance by trying to blot it out—especially since the blotting-out effort would only be partially successful.

How far the Soviet Union is willing to go in this blotting-out effort was illustrated just last weekend.

Throughout the visit to the United States of Mr. Brezhnev, the jamming of Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America continued unchanged in pattern or intensity—with one exception: When the Voice of America made a live broadcast of Mr. Brezhnev's June 24 radio speech, it went through wholly unjammed. But this was a special broadcast, outside the Voice's normal broadcast schedule to the USSR. The regularly scheduled VOA Russian-language programs preceding and following it were jammed as usual—even though they continued reports on Mr. Brezhnev's trip.

PROSPECTS FOR A CHANGE

I have been asked whether I feel that over a period of time the jamming activity might be lessened, as the leaders concerned realize either the futility of it or the desirability of having people know more, and having the right to know.

I would have to say that I have no basis for making firm prediction. It is possible that more of the East European leaderships will come to feel, like the Hungarian and Romanian leaders, that continued jamming is not effective enough to justify the cost and the tacit admission it involves: that they are afraid of the competition of information from outside. But I would hesitate to predict when or where this might happen.

As to their recognizing the desirability of their people having more information, particularly more information from sources outside their control, I hope and trust that it will happen someday, but I am not sanguine about its happening—particularly in the Soviet Union or any East European country closely tied to it—for some years to come.

On this broader point, of a basic change of philosophy, I would like to quote from the Presidential Study Commission's report (page 29-30):

"The Commission has also addressed itself to the question of how long RFE and RL must or should continue. It is our judgment that until the Soviet Union and East European countries change their attitudes and permit a free flow of truthful information, it is in the interests of the United States for the stations to continue. It may be envisioned that one or the other of the RFE audience countries will progress in its relaxation policy to such a degree as to permit discontinuation of broadcasts in that country's language. Such a change in the Soviet Union is probably more remote. The Commission feels that plans for the stations should be of a long-range nature . . ."

SUPPORT FOR RADIOS

Senator PERCY. I would like to say to the members of the Commission that the week I came on the Foreign Relations Committee last year was the week when this matter had reached a critical stage, and I didn't jump in with an awful lot of enthusiasm taking on, you might say, the chairman, whose views in many areas I have such a high regard for and who is a man of scholarship who feels deeply about matters he either is for or against. It was probably unpolitic for the most junior member of the committee to question the chairman on this issue, but I felt strongly about it. I had appeared on Radio Free Europe, I had seen the facilities in Munich, I had seen the dedication, I had seen the transition of the policies of the stations. I felt so strongly about it, equally strongly as the chairman does, so I did not hesitate in joining the debate. We did get 67 colleagues to join in support of the stations. I hope we will have somewhat comparable support this year, although I must say we are in a different atmosphere of budget consciousness which I applaud.

I want the Congress to look carefully at every authorization and appropriation to see what savings can be achieved. So we shall look carefully at the requests for the radios as well to determine if we can afford to make any reductions. If a cut is made, the staffs of Radio

Free Europe and Radio Liberty will have to understand that everyone is taking cuts now. But I am determined to see that the radios are not discriminated against and that they receive their fair allocation, because of the tremendous importance I place upon their work. I can assure the members of the Commission who have developed this report that those of us who deeply believe in the concept will be fighting very, very hard to see that we have a fair allocation of funds that can be justified to American taxpayers.

INFLATIONARY FORCE OF AGRICULTURE PRICES

Mr. EISENHOWER. One passing remark. I am also strongly in favor of reducing Federal costs and even increasing taxes if necessary as a brake on inflation, but as a former coordinator of the Department of Agriculture, may I ask someone to find out for me why we continue to spend \$6 to \$7 billion on agriculture when agricultural prices are the most potent force in inflation?

Senator PERCY. That was the battle of last week, Dr. Eisenhower, and only eight other Senators joined me in voting against what I considered to be an outrageous agricultural bill designed for the 1930's and not for the 1970's.

[Whereupon, at 1:10 p.m., the committee was recessed subject to call of the Chair.]

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

THURSDAY, JUNE 28, 1973

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to recess, at 10 a.m., in room 4221, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator J. W. Fulbright (chairman), presiding.

Present: Senators Fulbright, Sparkman, Humphrey, Aiken, Javits and Percy.

Also present: Mr. Marcy, Mr. Ritch, and Mr. Dockery of the committee staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

OPENING STATEMENT

The committee meets this morning to hear testimony on S. 1914, an administration bill sponsored by Senators Humphrey and Percy to provide funding for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

During the first day of hearings the committee heard from Kenneth Rush, Deputy Secretary of State and Dr. Milton Eisenhower, who directed a Presidential study on international broadcasting. Today the committee will hear from a variety of witnesses, including the two former American ambassadors, the former Undersecretary of State and independent communication consultants, and representatives of several East European groups in America.

We are very pleased this morning to have the former Ambassador to the United Nations and former distinguished Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, the Honorable Arthur Goldberg.

Mr. Goldberg has had a very long experience in public affairs both as representative of the great unions of this country as well, as I said, on the Supreme Court. I know of no one who has evidenced a greater interest in the fortunes of the American people and who served it more honorably and more wisely in recent years. We are very pleased indeed to have you. We would be greatly indebted to you to have your views about the wisdom of these operations.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PERCY

Senator PERCY. Ordinarily when we hold hearings I keep an open mind and I most certainly will, but I have to indicate to my distinguished friend, a Chicagoan for whom I have high regard, that in this case I have what might be described as a firm position. I do look forward very much to hearing his views.

I am also pleased that we will have testimony from such distinguished men as Ambassador Averell Harriman and former Under Secretary of State George Ball. I am interested as well in hearing the approach taken to international broadcasting by Paul Bartlett.

This afternoon we will have an outstanding journalist, David Halberstam, Professors Yuri Glasov and Roman Karst, and Dr. Ilgvar Spilners.

Our distinguished chairman and I have had a series of debates over the merits of the international broadcasting program. We have disagreed and possibly will continue to disagree for some time. Therefore, I welcome the support in this matter of other principal cosponsors of the bill, such as Senator Humphrey, and all of the witnesses who see merit in continuing the stations. If anyone can persuade the chairman that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty has continued importance as surrogate home services in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, I will be most grateful. I have been singularly unsuccessful in persuading the chairman. However, I would like to state that the chairman has been extremely fair in conducting the hearings, and all sides and points of view are being brought forward. I was very pleased yesterday that, though he disagreed with the outcome, through his persuasive powers we managed to get a quorum to adopt authorizing legislation for a supplemental for the radios to ameliorate the impact of the unforeseen devaluation in fiscal year 1973. This committee acted responsibly, and the chairman was very helpful in making certain that our work was done on time.

I intend to continue to work for continued funding of the radio stations in order to maintain steady flow of objective reporting for the people of these countries whose own media is so restricted and censored. I look forward to the day when all nations will stop jamming each other, when all nations will recognize that their peoples should have access to what is going on in the world. I hope as a part of negotiations between the two superpowers we can achieve more open societies for people everywhere. I would think if we can find ways to reduce the nuclear arms race, we can also find ways to dampen down the cold war as far as information is concerned.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Proceed.

**STATEMENT OF HON. ARTHUR GOLDBERG, FORMER AMBASSADOR
TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND FORMER SUPREME COURT
JUSTICE**

Mr. GOLDBERG. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee, I appreciate the invitation to appear before this distinguished committee to present my views relating to S. 1914, introduced by my friends of long standing, Senator Percy and Senator Humphrey, designed to provide for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting and to authorize the continuation of assistance to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

WITNESS SERVED IN OFFICE OF COORDINATOR OF INFORMATION

Mr. Chairman, in addition to your very overly generous introduction, I am not a stranger to this area.

I served early in World War II, in the Office of Coordinator of Information, I had to do with this general subject.

I turn now to the legislation under consideration by this committee.

WARTIME OPERATIONS SOMETIMES OUTLIVE USEFULNESS

By way of preliminary comment I should like to make an observation.

Activities such as were previously engaged in by the Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are natural in a declared war.

There is room for various types of operations in wartime which have no appropriate place in peacetime.

I shall cite an example from my personal experience later.

I was in charge in World War II of a division called the Labor Division of OSS. This was a very necessary and proper wartime operation. Laboring people of occupied Europe were opposed to Hitler, and as part of the war effort these private allies joined with us in various sabotage and intelligence activities directed at a common enemy, Hitler and the Nazi regime which regarded the social democratic and labor movement of Germany, Hitler's own country, and various other countries of Europe as a prime enemy.

As World War II was drawing to a close I proposed to General Donovan, my chief, a very fine leader, a wonderful American, that my opinion be liquidated. I said that the only purpose of the operation was to engage in work with the enslaved labor movement of Europe. My OSS division had no expertise in Asia. There was not a person on my staff including myself, who was an expert about the Orient at that time. I have learned a good deal since. And the labor movements of Asia were virtually nonexistent. My recommendation to wind up my operation was not accepted. It continued long after I was placed on inactive duty.

I mention this because I could see one of the problems here to be the great difficulty of winding up an establishment which may be worthwhile at a given time, but which outlives its usefulness. There are certain institutions in American life that are given perpetuity by the Constitution or by acts of Congress. The Office of the Presidency, the Congress, the Supreme Court and the various departments of Government. But there are many agencies created as a result of wartime exigencies, which continue long after their need.

Now, I have been a defender of the so-called bureaucracy. A bureaucracy does tend to perpetuate itself but the ultimate responsibility for the continuation of agencies which have outlived their usefulness is with the Chief Executive and Congress.

I do not know if the distinguished members of this committee have had the opportunity to read Ambassador Bohlen's recent book; it is an excellent book.

It is rather interesting to note that Ambassador Bohlen, who was an eyewitness to what was occurring, says in his book that it was never conceived our troops would remain in Europe for more than 2 or 3 years, until Europe got on its feet.

Now, it obviously took much longer to get Europe on its feet again as a result of the terrible devastation of World War II and, of course, the cold war intervened. Nevertheless, it struck me that here we are

almost 30 years after the conclusion of World War II and we are still in Europe in substantial forces, something never anticipated, although Europe is a different Europe today from what it was immediately after destruction and devastation of World War II.

Now I mention this by way of preliminary observations because I think it relevant to the subject at hand.

OPEN COMMUNICATION OF INFORMATION, IDEAS SUPPORTED

I wish to commend Senators Percy and Humphrey, the cosponsors of this legislation for their dedication to, and I quote them: "the open communication of information and ideas among the peoples of the world."

No one can differ with this great goal. The chairman has made a great contribution, too, in this area. The Fulbright fellowships for example.

I personally hope the day will come when the peoples of the world and governments will allow free communication to their peoples, and between countries. This is the most desirable objective.

I support this objective, but I do not believe that in light of past circumstances and present realities Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are effective instrumentalities in furtherance of this goal.

VOICE OF AMERICA

It is my view that the commendable purposes of the sponsors of S. 1914 are better served by giving support and strengthening the Voice of America.

The Voice of America, like its British counterpart, BBC, on the whole enjoys a good record of reporting facts in the tradition of our free press, radio and television.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman and distinguished Senators, I should like to express my concern about recent newspaper reports of governmental directives to the Voice of America to tone down its reporting about Watergate and its sordid aftermath. I particularly decry the fact that the Voice of America just the other day denied to BBC the traditional courtesy of allowing its facilities to be used for broadcasts relating to the Watergate situation. There is no reason I can see why we should not be courteous to the BBC, which I am sure would extend similar privileges to the Voice of America. The fact that the contents of BBC Watergate programs is something not pleasing to our Government is not, in my opinion, a valid reason for denying the BBC access to instrumentalities that the BBC traditionally has employed.

After all, the broadcasts would go forward, not as Voice of America broadcasts, but as BBC broadcasts.

But when I prepared the testimony I had reference to prior newspaper articles which indicated that there were some directives to the Voice of America that they tone down on their reporting of what was going on in this body in connection with the Watergate matter.

I would also, at this time, wish to express the hope that the Voice of America will be adequately funded to carry on its important functions.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have long believed that the best propaganda is the unvarnished truth. Factual re-

porting and objective interpreting by the Voice of America, the official broadcasting agency of the U.S. Government, demonstrates, to quote the first Chief Justice of the United States, John Jay, that the air of American life is indeed free. I have long believed in the spirit of Chief Justice Jay's observation that objective news and commentary by the Voice of America is in the best interests of the United States.

It is not always comfortable for those who direct the Voice of America to tell things about our country that are not pleasant to hear. Nevertheless, it serves our country and its posture abroad to broadcast the truth about what is going on here, distasteful and tragic as it may be.

Surely this is an object lesson to those who live in societies of repression to know that our country is a free country, willing to expose its shortcomings as well as its accomplishments.

EUROPEAN LISTENED TO BBC IN WORLD WAR II

If I may again interject from my own experience in World War II, where there were allied clandestine radio stations operating purporting to broadcast within Germany. The German people early recognized the nature and character of these operations and tended to discount them. But, at great risk to themselves the people of occupied Europe used to choose to listen to BBC because BBC even in wartime adhered to the simple concept of reporting the facts, defeats as well as victories, both accomplishments and setbacks. And the people of Europe tuned in to BBC, whatever the risk, to learn indeed what was going on.

FINANCING OF RADIO FREE EUROPE, RADIO LIBERTY

Now, the record of this committee shows and everybody knows that in times past Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were clandestinely financed by our Government; namely, by the CIA, and engaged in propaganda which created false hopes among the captive peoples of Eastern Europe.

Now in our day this may no longer be the case. We are advised that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty now confine themselves to providing a unique information service to the people of Eastern Europe, a service which is publicly and openly financed by the United States.

I think it ought to be said in this connection that it was Congress which took hold and terminated this clandestine financing and by act of Congress provided for open financing for RFE and RL. It was also Congress which in hearings and reports pointed out the danger of exciting false hopes among the people of Eastern Europe.

U.S. ROLE WITH REGARD TO CAPTIVE PEOPLE OF EASTERN EUROPE

Now, I do not yield to any person my conviction that the people of Eastern Europe are held in captivity. My own travels and diplomatic experience indicate to me that the countries and people of Eastern Europe by and large do not want to be occupied as they are in effect, and incorporated, as some of them are, in the Soviet Union. But we are talking today about the role that the United States can properly play in this connection.

We know from the experience of Hungary and Czechoslovakia that we are not prepared to intervene militarily to oust the Soviets.

This being the case, we now must consider the peaceful role of broadcasting to the peoples of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

I also do not yield to anyone my distaste for the repression which is going on in the Soviet Union and in other Eastern European countries.

Indeed, when I was at the U.N., I must say contrary to the advice of our State Department, I went to the Human Rights Commission and protested the repression of intellectuals by the Soviet Union.

PERFORMANCE OF RFE, RL FUNCTIONS BY VOA

It is asserted in the Report of the Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty provide a unique information service which is publicly and openly financed by the United States, indeed, I have noticed a directive has now been issued that at the conclusion of each broadcast by these agencies that it is to be indicated that the broadcasts are financed by the United States.

Now, if this is the case, and assuming that the directives now are followed against engaging in blatant propaganda, I am at loss to understand why RFE and RL functions cannot and should not be performed by the Voice of America, which is free from the past practices and involvements of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

USE OF BRACKETS IN COMMISSION REPORT

Now, if I may draw upon my former judicial experience I would like to make a suggestion to the committee and also perhaps with all deference to the members of the Commission.

When items are quoted extolling the virtues of the radio broadcasts, which presumably emanate from Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, I notice that there are brackets around references to Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I wonder about those brackets and the reason I wonder about them is this.

The broadcasts may have been broadcasts from the Voice of America or BBC. Now, perhaps this is something I assumed but I think it incumbent when a report like this is filed to the Senate to make clear that was what was referred to by people giving testimony in support of their efficacy, what broadcasts are referred to.

The CHAIRMAN. What page are you?

Mr. GOLDBERG. I found it several places, Senator. I can provide you the places. But I notice in the report several times that when evidence in support of these particular broadcasts, the brackets are around the source of the broadcast to indicate Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

Now, perhaps this is only a grammatical thing to do. Perhaps members of the staff can identify them better than I can at the moment. I notice that that appears in several places.

Now, if indeed Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were referred to, and perhaps they were, then we ought to be advised why brackets are being used.

The CHAIRMAN. Are you referring, for example, on the first page,

the brackets around this quote attributed to Solzhenitsyn? Where are you reading from?

Mr. GOLDBERG. Right on the first page.

The CHAIRMAN. The first page, it is in brackets. Are you saying that Solzhenitsyn did not refer to Radio Liberty?

Mr. GOLDBERG. I do not know. I am not saying I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Why are the brackets?

Mr. GOLDBERG. I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. I see.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I say that only because of this. First of all, in any legal document if you use brackets you ought to then footnote where your prior reference was but—

The CHAIRMAN. He could have been referring to BBC, in other words.

Mr. GOLDBERG. BBC, Voice of America. I am not saying it was.

The CHAIRMAN. I know.

Mr. GOLDBERG. It is a very honorable committee. I do not think that they would in any way attempt to deceive this committee. The Commission is very honorable. I do not think they would attempt to deceive it in any way. I say on a sense of how a statement like this ought to be made and also because my experience differed from the experience of the members of the Commission.

WITNESS' EXPERIENCE IN RUSSIA WHEN ASTRONAUTS LANDED ON MOON

When I was in Russia, Senator Humphrey was there at the same hotel, I remember our astronauts landed on the moon and the Soviet papers carried no stories about it and I am sure the Senator had the experience I had, many people, American and Russian, came up to me and in effect, said what was going on? But in a day or two they no longer came up and said what was going on, and I asked why, and they said because we heard from Voice of America what was going on. What they referred to was Voice of America, not Radio Liberty, and perhaps I approach it from this vantage point.

Now, let us get to the nub of the argument in support of the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

It is mainly argued—

CLARIFICATION OF OBJECTION ON SOLZHENITSYN QUOTE

Senator PERCY. Would you clarify for me what the objection is? As I understand it, this quotation is from Alexander Solzhenitsyn, a noted Russian author.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Yes, sir.

Senator PERCY. He apparently was interviewed by an American newsman in the New York Times.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Right.

Senator PERCY. And this is a reference to that. It might have been carried on Radio Liberty, as I understand it, and they quoted from this interview. Maybe it is a self-promotion but at least they are giving the source, and they are indicating that they rebroadcast it. What is the objection?

Mr. GOLDBERG. Senator, it might very well be on Radio Liberty but

they use brackets when they said Radio Liberty. It might be he was referring to broadcasts.

Senator PERCY. We could very easily determine whether in that interview there was any misleading statement. I cannot imagine that Dr. Eisenhower would permit the use of a misleading quotation.

Mr. GOLDBERG. It is hard for me to conceive that, too. All I am saying—

Senator PERCY. To satisfy your curiosity we will ask the staff immediately to check that and—

Mr. GOLDBERG. Why use brackets then?

Senator PERCY. The staff has already certified that it is being checked.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I am not in disagreement with you. I said this is a distinguished committee. I cannot conceive they would in any way wittingly or unwittingly confuse the committee. All I am saying is that in looking at it I saw brackets. I have great admiration for Solzhenitsyn, I think he is one of the greatest novelists of all times, and when you use brackets—footnote: Maybe he used Radio Liberty earlier and it is inconvenient to repeat it at this time. So all I am saying—straighten out the record.

Senator PERCY. Well, to make the record complete, I ask unanimous consent that when we find the article it be incorporated in the record at this point.

The Chairman. Without objection.

[The information referred to follows:]

[From the New York Times, Apr. 3, 1972]

EXCERPTS FROM THE TRANSCRIPT OF THE CONVERSATION WITH
SOLZHENITSYN IN MOSCOW

Moscow, Apr. 2.—Following are excerpts from a conversation with Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn, the writer. The discussion was in Russian and was later translated into English by Theodore Shabad of the New York Times Moscow bureau.

Q. In your funeral lament for Aleksandr T. Tvardovsky, the poet, you recalled that Pushkin suffered exile and disgrace at the hands of the Czar. Is this a typical Russian condition? Are harassment, censorship and imprisonment of great writers permanent features of Russian life?

A. Your question is not a subject for a brief, superficial conversation. If we want to reply to that question, we would have to speak seriously about Russian traditions, how they have been changing from decade to decade, what they have in common, in what ways they have differed. It would be indiscreet for me to talk about these things in a few, brief, superficial words.

In short, to answer that question would require a great deal of literary research that might take months or years. I personally do not engage in such research and have no intention of doing so.

SOVIET WRITERS DISCUSSED

Q. What has happened to the creative energy of the early nineteen-sixties, which is identified in the West with the work of Voznesensky, Yevtushenko, Akhmatova and others? Did these writers achieve less than was thought at the time? Has the public lost interest or has the political atmosphere stifled creativity?

A. The names that you mention did indeed become known not only in this country but also in the West—actually the period began in the late fifties. I do not intend to comment on the work of others, but I will reply to your question in general terms. When a writer deals with themes of eternal significance, his work is likely to remain valid for longer periods of time. Other writers may be concerned with highly topical questions, and as long as those questions are topical, their work will tend to remain in the limelight. But later it will recede to the background.

I would say that the names you listed are more popular now in the West than in the Soviet Union.

But that does not mean that [word lost] is finished or that creativity in literature generally has become extinguished. No, all it means is that the work has reached a deeper level. Furthermore, not all the work of our writers has yet been published and therefore cannot be known to you.

Q. Can you name any of these other, deeper writers?

A. I could name some writers who are doing serious work and have accomplished a great deal. But I fear that if I were to name them, this might cause them harm.

Q. In the world outside the Soviet Union, you are a literary hero, a literary symbol to people in the West of a free spirit struggling within a closed society. All your public utterances receive enormous publicity in the outside world. What is your reaction to this?

A. You know, I would prefer to be published widely in my own country.

Q. We heard that there are other versions of "The First Circle" than the one we are familiar with. And that, perhaps, as a result of criticism published in the West you changed the book. What about that?

A. I worked for many years on that novel. I started it while I was in exile. There were indeed different versions. As it happened, I submitted one of these versions in 1964 for publication in Novy Mir [Russian literary monthly]. Tvardovsky intended to publish it. But then the editors of Novy Mir proposed some changes. In the meantime, the novel began to be circulated in samizdat [underground circulation of unpublished works] and one of the versions—maybe more than one—reached the West and was published there. I am not even sure whether the same version was published in different countries.

LATEST VERSION PREFERRED

Q. Does that mean that there is another fuller version of "The First Circle" which we do not yet know in the West?

A. Actually I continued to work on that novel after it was published in the West, and the latest version is the one I prefer.

Q. Beginning with "August, 1914," are you planning a series of works to try to explain the Bolshevik Revolution? What are you working on now?

A. "October, 1916"—the second volume of this overall work. It will be mostly about the rear, not the military front, in the war. All the important events of that month take place in the rear.

Q. Will it be finished soon?

A. No, in the course of the work, it turned out to be more complex than I had assumed.

Q. Since you are now working on historical novels, rather than drawing on personal experience as you did in earlier works, how do you do your research? Can you use state libraries freely even though you have been expelled from the writers' union?

A. In my youth, there were special obstacles in my way. But now, you Westerners cannot imagine my situation. I live in my own country, I write a novel about Russia. But it is as hard for me to gather material as it would be if I were writing about Polynesia.

For the present volume, I should spend some time in certain historical buildings, but they are now occupied by Government institutions and the authorities will not give me a pass. I am also blocked from access to central and oblast [provincial] archives.

I should talk with old residents who are the last surviving witnesses. But this requires approval and help from local authorities, which I also cannot get. And without that permission, everyone shuts up. Because of suspicions, nobody will tell me a thing, and without authorization, I could be arrested at every step of the way. That has already been tested.

Q. Can you get people to work for you to help you do research?

A. No. They cannot work for me. In the first place, as a nonmember of the Union of Writers [he was expelled in November, 1969], I am not entitled either to a secretary or an assistant. Second, such a secretary, representing my interests, would be just as restricted and hemmed in as I am. Third, I simply would not be able to pay a secretary.

FUNDS COMING TO AN END

Since the royalties for "Ivan Denisovich [his first novella, published in Novy Mir in 1962] I have had no significant income except for money left me by the late K. L. Chukovsky [a writer of books for children, who died in 1965], and now even it is coming to an end.

The royalties lasted me for six years and Chukovsky's money for three. I was able to make them last so long by keeping my expenditures at the basic level of my teaching days. I never spend more on myself than I would have to pay a secretary.

Q. What about the money you have earned in the West?

A. I have drawn up a will and when possibilities arise these royalties will be sent by my lawyer to be spent on the general welfare in my country.

I personally will make use only of the Nobel Prize money and that is, of course, quite a bit [about \$80,000] except that the problem of getting that money has been made degrading, difficult and uncertain for me. The Ministry of Foreign Trade told me that every transaction requires a special decision of the ministry's board and that anyway I would receive only a certain percentage.

VOLUNTARY HELP CITED

Q. You mentioned the problems of your research work previously. But how do you actually get it done?

A. Here again you have a special feature of our life that a Westerner probably finds hard to understand. As I understand it, and I may be wrong, it is customary in the West to get paid for any kind of work and it is unusual for work to be done for nothing. But take our samizdat, that certainly goes on without any money changing hands. People expend their labor, their free time. They sit up nights, doing work for which the most they can get is persecution. And that happens to be true in my case.

The subject I am working on is well known throughout the community, even outside Moscow. And well-wishers, often unknown to me, send me—of course not by mail, which might not reach me—their own memoirs and all kinds of books, even some of the rarest and so on.

Sometimes these materials are exactly what I need and sometimes they are not so useful. But the fact that these materials are being sent to me always touches me and gives me the real feeling that I am working for Russia and Russia is helping me.

HARASSMENT DESCRIBED

At this point, Mr. Solzhenitsyn turned to a discussion of the harassment of his family and friends.

All this can be quite dangerous. A kind of forbidden, contaminated zone has been created around my family, and to this day there are people in Ryazan who were dismissed from their jobs for having visited my house a few years ago.

A corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, T. Timofeyev [Timur T. Timofeyev, director of the Institute of the International Workers Movement] became so scared when he found out that a mathematician working under him was my wife that he dismissed her with unseemly haste, although this was just after she had given birth and contrary to all laws.

It happens that an informant may meet with me. We work an hour or two and as soon as he leaves my house, he will be closely followed as if he were a state criminal and they will investigate his background. And then they go on to find out who this man meets and then, in turn, with whom that person is meeting.

And if you consider that they listen around the clock to telephone conversations and conversations in my home, they analyze recording tapes and all correspondence, and then collect and compare all these data in some vast premises—and these people are not underlings.

ARCHIVES CONFISCATED IN '65

In 1965, they confiscated my archives and were horrified at my writings about the labor camp era, as if these writings carried the imprint of the condemned. If these had been the Stalin years, nothing could have been simpler. I would have disappeared and that would have been it—no one would have asked any questions. But after the 20th and 22d congresses [of the Communist party, at which Stalinism was officially denounced], things were more complicated.

First they decided to keep me quiet. The idea was that not a line would be written about me, no one would ever mention my name, even to curse it, and after a few years I would be forgotten. And then take [me] away. But this was already the time of samizdat, and my books were spreading through the country, and going abroad. There was no way to keep me quiet.

At that point they started—and they continue to this day—to slander me behind closed doors. It is almost impossible for a Westerner to imagine how this works.

INDOCTRINATION EXPLAINED

We have throughout this country an established network of party and public indoctrination and a lecture network. There is no institution or military unit, no district seat or state farm where lecturers and propagandists do not give speeches according to a schedule. And all of them, everywhere, at the same time, say one and the same thing based on instructions from a single center.

These instructions may come in different versions—for the capital, for provincial centers, for the army, for academic institutions, and so on. Since these lectures are attended only by the staff members of the institution or people living in a particular area, they may be considered closed, or are closed outright.

Since 1966, the orders have gone out to talk about me: first, that I was imprisoned under Stalin for something serious, that I was improperly rehabilitated, that my literary works are criminal, and so forth. As it happens, the lecturers themselves never in their lives read these works because the authorities were afraid to let them have them, and the lecturers were simply ordered to talk that way.

NOBODY TO COMPLAIN TO

The lectures are attended only by insiders. On the outside it's a peaceful paradise and no defamation whatever, while irrefutable slander is poured over the country. You can't travel to all the cities, you are not admitted into closed lecture halls. There are thousands of these lectures. There is nobody to complain to. This slander takes hold of people's minds.

You are wondering how I know all this?

We live in a new era, in different times. Both from the provinces and in Moscow, a great deal reaches me. In these times, all these lectures, even the most closed, are attended by my well-wishers and then, in various ways, I learn that on a certain date in a certain auditorium, lecturer so-and-so told such-and-such a lie and muck about me.

In these lectures they talk a lot of nonsense. At one time they kept harping on my family life, without knowing what they were talking about, and they did it at the lowest gutter level. One begins to wonder about the level of employment in this country, and what people are being paid for, if not only market women but paid propagandists in the system of political indoctrination start holding forth about someone's marriage and the birth and baptism of a son.

JEWISH FORBEARS HINTED

There was a time when they liked to play around with my patronymic, Isayevich [which translates as "Son of Isaiah"]. They used to say, in passing, "Incidentally, his real name is Solzhenitser or Solzhenitsker [names that have a Jewish sound to Russians], but of course that doesn't mean anything in our country."

There was one serious charge that always got the attention of the listeners: "traitor to his country." In general in our country we seem to try to bait people not with arguments, but with the most primitive labels, the coarsest names, and also the simplest-designed, as they say, to arouse the fury of the masses.

In the twenties it was "counterrevolutionary." In the thirties, "enemy of the people." Since the forties "traitor to the country." You should have seen how they leafed through my military record, how they tried to establish that I might have been a prisoner of war for at least a day or two, like Ivan Denisovich—that would have been a real find!

Actually behind closed doors you can make a gullible public believe any lie, and for years in lecture halls far and wide, throughout the country, they would say, "Solzhenitsyn voluntarily gave himself up to the Germans—No, he surrendered a whole battery. And he served as a policeman in occupied territory, i.e., for the Germans. Or even better, he fought with Vlasov [Andrei Vlasov, a Soviet general captured by the Germans, who organized an anti-Communist movement]. Even better, he worked right in the Gestapo."

THE CANCER OF SLANDER

On the surface, everything is quiet, no defamation, but under the crust is the cancer of slander.

As it happened, the Soviet press had to acknowledge that my military record was unblemished. The fog was hanging there without rain, and it started to clear away.

And after I had been expelled from the Union of Writers, there were open hints that I should get out of the country, to justify the charge of "traitor to his country."

Then the fuss began around the Nobel Prize. Now the word from all the speakers' platforms was: the Nobel Prize is Judas payment for betrayal of one's country. And they still keep repeating this without worrying whether that might cast a shadow, say, on Pablo Neruda [the Chilean Communist poet who won the prize for literature in 1971]. In effect, they were unreservedly insulting all Nobel laureates and the very institution of the Nobel Prizes.

The plan is either to drive me out of my life or out of the country, throw me into a ditch or send me to Siberia, or to have me dissolve "in an alien fog," as they write.

LESSONS OF HISTORY STRESSED

In general, in all this defamation we see only the stupidity and shortsightedness of those who direct it. They refuse to acknowledge the complexity and richness of history in its diversity. All they are concerned with is to silence all the voices that they find unpleasant to the ear, or that deprive them of today's calm. And they don't worry about the future. By senselessly silencing Novy Mir and Tvardovsky, they themselves were made poorer, they were made blind, and they refuse to understand their loss.

The study of Russian history, which has led me back to the end of the last century, has shown me how valuable peaceful outlets are for a country, how important it is that authority, no matter how autocratic and unlimited, should listen with goodwill to society, and that society should assume the position of real power, how important it would be not to have strength and violence, but righteousness, guide the country.

MEMORIES OF FAMILY

At several points, Mr. Solzhenitsyn, seeking to rebut recent articles in the Soviet press, and the West German magazine Der Stern that suggested his forebears were well-to-do, reminisced about his parents.

[My mother] raised me in very difficult conditions. She was widowed before I was born and never remarried, mainly because she was afraid that a stepfather would be too strict. We lived 19 years in Rostov before the war and for 15 of these we could not get a room from the state. All the time we had to find some broken-down little huts from private owners for a great deal of money. And when we finally did get a room, it was part of a reconstructed stable.

It was always cold. There was a draft. The coal we used for heat was hard to get. Water had to be carried from afar. I actually only learned recently what running water in an apartment meant.

Mama knew French and English well, and had also studied shorthand and typing. But agencies that paid well never hired her because of her social origin. Even harmless agencies like Melstroi [the flour-mill construction agency] purged her, meaning that they dismissed her with restrictions on her future rights. This forced her to look for outside work in the evening.

MOTHER DIED DURING WAR

She did the housework late at night, and was always short of sleep. She suffered frequent head colds, became ill with tuberculosis and died at the age of 49. I was at the front at the time and didn't get to see her grave until 12 years later, after labor camp and exile.

My mother sent me two or three times during summer vacation to my Aunt Irina but the rest [the aunt's recollection, reported in Der Stern, of having raised Mr. Solzhenitsyn] is the fruit of her imagination, which already must be fuzzy. I never lived with her.

My only memory of my father is from photographs and the stories by my mother and people who had known him. While a student at the university he

volunteered for the front [in the Czarist army in World War I] and served in the Grenadier Artillery Brigade. Once when the battery was set afire, he saved some munition boxes himself.

The three officers' decorations that he left from World War I—which in my childhood were considered the mark of a dangerous criminal—were buried by my mother and me out of fear of a search.

When the whole front was collapsing, the battery in which my father served remained on the front lines until the Treaty of Brest [1918]. My mother and my father were married at the front by a brigade priest.

Papa returned home in the spring of 1918, and soon thereafter died as a result of an accident and poor medical care. His grave in Georgiyevsk [a city in the northern Caucasus] was leveled by a tractor in the construction of a stadium.

ARGUMENT ABOUT "INDEPENDENCE" OF RFE, RL

Now, the main argument in the report of the distinguished Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting in support of the continuation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is that these institutions, unlike the Voice of America, are "independent" of the U.S. Government and that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are, therefore, free to express views which the Voice of America, the official governmental radio, must avoid saying to obviate the charge of interfering in the internal affairs of other nations.

Part of the argumentation is that RFE and RL devote considerable hours to what is going on inside the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union while Voice of America devotes its major time to what is going on in our own country. It is my understanding, however, that like BBC the Voice of America devotes considerable time to developments that are going on in the Soviet Union and the Eastern European blocs as well as developments in the United States.

Now, the argument about "independence" of RFE and RL, to avoid the charge of interfering in the internal affairs of other nations, simply does not wash, and I shall say why.

S. 1914 provides that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty are to be funded by the U.S. Government, and one of their guidelines is provision for a statement at the end of each broadcast that this indeed is the case.

True, the hope is expressed that private businesses and other institutions will contribute money. But that hope thus far is more a dream than a reality. RFE and RL have not been funded privately. Were they funded privately we would not be having these hearings.

The first amendment permits their right, any private institution the right to say anything they want even in the area of foreign affairs and we would not be meeting here today to discuss this because it would be a first amendment right to broadcast anything they wanted to about other governments.

Now, if these agencies are funded by the American Government, as they are, it is very difficult for me to understand why their broadcasts, openly paid for by the American taxpayers, are to be regarded by foreign governments as any less an interference in their internal affairs than Voice of America broadcasts.

Furthermore, I have had 3 years of diplomatic experience in dealing with Communist countries and they are not as sensitive as the report of this Commission would indicate.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA BROADCASTS TO UNITED STATES: WHO LISTENS?

They do not hesitate to broadcast propaganda about our internal affairs. And we accept that as a fact of international life.

The CHAIRMAN. They broadcast to this country?

Mr. GOLDBERG. Some of them broadcast to this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you ever hear anybody listen to them?

Mr. GOLDBERG. I do not know anybody in this country who listens. My impression is that they waste their money.

Senator HUMPHREY. There is a very large group of people in this country that has shortwave-band radios, and I think this record would be replete with inconsistency and inadequate information if we did not indicate that there are literally thousands of people that listen to shortwave broadcasts. I had in my office yesterday from the Presidential Classroom nine people, and, of the nine, seven of them were talking about this hearing and said that the real problem with your committee, Senator Humphrey, is that you are all so busy you do not listen to shortwave broadcasts, and a lot of people do. And there is a group of what they call ham operators, and there are thousands of them across the country. Many of them are in the publication business, many are in the information or media business, and I do not think we ought to have it appear that just because we do not listen to shortwave that some of the rest of the folks do not. They do. The ham operators have one of the largest conventions of any organization in the United States. At least they get people to come.

I thought that I would add to the record.

Senator PERCY. Senator Goldwater is the biggest ham of all, is he not?

Senator HUMPHREY. Better to be called a ham than an operator.

Senator PERCY. I think he would be proud to be known as that in the fraternity.

Senator HUMPHREY. I want to make the record clear I did not call him an operator.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I know that there are ham operators—Senator Goldwater is undoubtedly the most distinguished one—who do listen. I was going to add a sentence which perhaps would have explained more adequately what I wanted to say when the chairman asked me do I know of anybody who listens. I do not know whether Senator Goldwater spends his time listening to Soviet propaganda broadcasts; I rather had the impression he spends his time trying to help people in distress or in need or transmitting messages to family and friends, which he does very well.

I was going to say that the blatancy of the propaganda that issues from Eastern Europe and Russians is such that I cannot conceive that Americans are affected by it.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not think Mr. Goldwater has been subverted by the Russian broadcasts?

Mr. GOLDBERG. I do not see any evidence or probability of that occurring.

I once tried fiddling around with shortwave radio to hear what was going on in the world. But based upon my own limited experience I cannot conceive that the blatant type of propaganda that comes out of the Communist countries has any effect in our country.

Senator HUMPHREY. We have better propaganda called commercials.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Yes, commercials regrettably often do have an undue influence.

IMMUNIZING RFE, RL FROM GOVERNMENT AGENCY CHARGE

It is argued in the Commission's report that the interposition of the Board for International Broadcasting will in some way immunize Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty from the charge that it is a governmental agency. I do not believe the countries and peoples of Eastern Europe are that naive. They understand, in the Commission's own words, that these institutions, do "not operate in the manner inconsistent with the U.S. foreign policy objectives." In other words, the people of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union must realistically recognize that he who pays the piper calls the tune.

VOA FREE TO DO ANYTHING RFE, RL CAN DO

The ultimate fact to me is that the Voice of America is free to do anything that Radio Liberty or Radio Free Europe can or properly should do. As long as the Voice of America expresses the truth about developments here and abroad, objections of interfering in other countries' internal affairs can properly be rejected by our Government.

And I am not aware from my diplomatic experience, of any serious representation ever made to our Government about Voice of America broadcasts. If so, it would seem to me very simple diplomatically to reject such protests on the simple basis that we believe in open communication of ideas and further that the countries of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union broadcast to us. We, on the whole, do it truthfully and they do it propagandistically.

DEALING WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

One last thought which I have not in my prepared statement. It is said in this report that the continuation of these two agencies will enhance rather than militate against détente with the Soviet Union and with the Eastern bloc.

This is a strange argument to me. I am for détente. But I caution against assuming in dealing with Communist countries that a change in the weather is a change in the climate. There has been a change in the weather as far as the Soviet Union and its satellite countries in Eastern Europe are concerned. We should welcome this change in the weather. But we should keep our guard up.

I have no doubt in my own mind that with respect to the Soviet Union and China, there has been no change in the essential climate of ideology. I have the strong conviction that changes in their ideology will have to come from themselves and not imposed from abroad. There are, however, things we can properly do in this area.

One is put our own house in order. This might have the most profound repercussions throughout the world. In my opinion, at the present juncture this is our first foreign policy priority.

The second thing we can appropriately do is factual reporting and interpreting by our Government through the Voice of America, which

has established its credibility by reporting our virtues and our defects, our accomplishments and our shortcomings.

RFE, RL HAVE OUTLIVED USEFULNESS

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I believe that Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty have outlived their usefulness. This is not to say that they did not serve us well in the past, whatever their shortcomings, but time works changes and I see at the present moment no good reason to perpetuate these institutions.

BROADCAST FUNDING

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Justice.

I would like to put one or two things in the record.

I want the record to show that the committee has already authorized full funding for the Voice of America as requested by the administration for their operations for the coming year. The requests for international broadcasting which are before the Congress are: \$56 million, which the committee granted for VOA; for RFE/RL, the request which is before us is \$50 million; and then the Armed Forces network overseas which serves a very large part of the world, \$27 million. It is \$133 million for broadcast outside of the United States. This is in contrast to the domestic Corporation for Public Broadcasting for which \$45 million is requested.

Senator HUMPHREY. How much is public broadcasting?

The CHAIRMAN. Domestic, \$45 million, foreign, \$133 million.

EFFECTS OF PROPAGANDA BROADCASTS

You have already covered some of my questions. I take it that you do not think it is wise at this late stage to try to stir up revolution in Eastern Europe or in Russia—that it would not be wise policy.

Mr. GOLDBERG. It simply would not work, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not work. And it would not serve either our purposes or the interests of peace.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I would welcome democratic governments throughout the world but it has not been demonstrated that propaganda broadcasts achieve them.

The CHAIRMAN. You referred to most of these questions. Do you feel that these broadcasts make any contribution to the movement that the President has initiated toward a reconciliation with the Russians?

Mr. GOLDBERG. No, I do not. I do believe that the Voice of America is at liberty to report the facts all over the world and should continue to do so, and also interpret the facts. As long as it does so objectively and truthfully, but I do not believe that the broadcast of RFE and RL add anything significant to what the Voice of America is doing.

BROADCASTS OF WESTERN EUROPEAN STATIONS TO U.S.S.R., EASTERN EUROPE

The CHAIRMAN. Today the committee has been informed that, not including the RFE and RL, that the principal official western stations, Western European stations, and western country stations broadcast to the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe a weekly total of 822 program hours

in many languages. These stations are, of course, the Voice of America, the BBC, the official radio of France, West Germany, Italy, Vatican, and Israel. And RIS. That is the radio in the American sector in Berlin.

In light of this barrage of broadcasting, is it not a bit excessive to portray the people of Eastern Europe as being captive in the prison of ignorance about events?

Mr. GOLDBERG. Yes, I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is not a good comparison just to compute the amount of hours that we alone spend. We also have to look at the hours that other democratic governments such as you have mentioned broadcast. In this connection there is in the Commission report a statement it is desirable to enlist from other democratic governments in support of RFE and RL. This seems to me somewhat inconsistent with the Commission's recommendation that funding in addition to grants from our own Government should be sought.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM EUROPEAN GOVERNMENTS FOR RFE, RL

The CHAIRMAN. About this time a year ago, Mr. Stikker and others undertook to solicit assistance from European governments for the support of these radios.

Some of my colleagues and I made an effort to discontinue the radios then, and the main reason I gave is the cost of it. If we did not have to pay for it, I would not object to anybody broadcasting. But \$50 million is entirely excessive in view of our other responsibilities and the costs. They met that argument by saying we will solicit assistance, and they were quite confident that they would get assistance from Western European countries, but so far they have gotten nothing whatever. Now they take the opposite view, they do not want any.

Mr. GOLDBERG. The report says such assistance would not be welcome.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Aiken.

Senator AIKEN. Reference has been made to Mr. Stikker and Alexis Johnson. We might insert in the record at this point what they said in their testimony before the committee. Both Dr. Stikker and the Honorable Alexis Johnson agreed that others should contribute to the financial support of the radios. Dr. Stikker told the committee on June 6, 1972, "Let me state most emphatically that I personally fully agree with your stated view that it is time for West Europeans to begin sharing the financial burden of these radio operations." Similarly, the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs informed the committee on June 7, and I quote from the report: "I fully share the view that, to the extent possible, funds other than U.S. Government funds should be solicited to support these programs."

The report goes on:

The Committee's swift and decisive action to approve continued Government funding for the radios through fiscal 1973 should be more than sufficient to indicate the U.S. commitment to the radios but this is not an open ended commitment and the extent to which it continues in the future will be determined by the kind of financial support that can be generated during the coming year among the Western European nations.

I think it may be recalled that these radio programs were continued, I think, on a continuing resolution which expired about early March. They may have expired in February. But they had funds enough left

from somewhere to continue for a while and then we gave them another continuing resolution till the end of the fiscal year, after which it appeared that they still had money enough to run for about a month, until about the first of August. Then we gave them this probationary law, I would call it, that they raise funds from other sources and that the United States not be required to bear the entire cost of these, regardless of how beneficial they may have been to those people. It appeared at that time, according to the testimony as I recall it, that certain American industries had contributed thinking that it would drum up some business for them in that area. I do not know whether they are still interested or not, but they had better come through with their contributions if they are. That is all I can say. Some of them have subsidiary connections over there, if I am correctly informed. What I am pointing out is we have given them a year's time in which to correct the situation and now instead of correcting that they are asking us for—I do not know how much more money, but more money. I think we have gone far enough. In my opinion, they laugh at us.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Senator, I could not agree with you more. I should like to point out, however, a dilemma. How can Western European governments contribute funds to RFE and RL which will operate, as recommended by the Commission, to further the foreign policy interests of the United States? As friendly as they may be, as good allies as they may be, it would seem to me that Western European countries would be inhibited in contributing funds to further our foreign policy interests which may or may not coincide with theirs.

Senator AIKEN. Let me add one thing more. If these folks over there who are supposed to be the beneficiaries of these programs will show a willingness to cooperate in carrying them on, I would be inclined to cooperate with them, but unless they are willing to do that, I would suggest that perhaps at most we give them another month continuing resolution to see if they really mean it or whether they want to play us for a bunch of suckers over here.

FINANCING IN PART BY PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS

Mr. GOLDBERG. Certainly, there is nothing wrong with that, but that is, of course for the committee to determine. But I would like to point out one danger about RFE and RL being financed in part by our Government and in part by business and other private institutions.

I have no objection to private broadcasts if the NAM and Chamber of Commerce want to sponsor broadcasts directed to Eastern Europe, I am sure they can make arrangements. But a partnership between private groups in the foreign broadcasting area seems to me inadvisable.

SENATORS PERCY, JAVITS QUOTED ON FUNDING

The CHAIRMAN. Since Senator Aiken has opened this matter, the record would not be complete without quoting two of the most eloquent spokesmen on this subject. A year ago Senator Percy said, and I quote:

I feel that the time has long since passed when the United States should underwrite the total cost of projects which are done in the mutual interest of Eastern Europe and the United States.

And then Senator Javits, also a proponent and cosponsor of this bill, said this:

I think that we ought to carry on for the year and give Europe the opportunity, but I would like to emphasize if we do there will be a real obligation on the part of Europeans to see that this year is not wasted and that the collaborative effort which is called for is forthcoming.

That will make the record complete.

RELIEF FOR U.S. TAXPAYERS SOUGHT

Of course, I was primarily seeking to relieve the taxpayers of the \$50 million. I merely said I would be willing personally for my vote to give them the facilities if they want to carry them on. Even if they would pay half, I would pay half only because it would save us \$25 million and it would not be as bad as it is. I still think in view of our fiscal responsibilities and the deficits we have, it is a major consideration. Is it worthwhile to spend \$50 million for this purpose? I would think it would be better to add it to our own public broadcasting. They are doing a great job, I think, in trying to inform the American people.

One or two other questions and then I will desist.

NEWS CENSORSHIP IN COUNTRIES FROM WHICH RADIOS BROADCAST

Radio Free Europe has transmitters in West Germany and Portugal. Radio Liberty has transmitters in West Germany, Spain, and Taiwan. We also have a very large transmitter, VOA, in Greece.

Do you find any incongruity in the fact that there is probably just about as much news censorship in several of the countries from which the radios are broadcasting as there is in the countries to which they are broadcasting?

Mr. GOLDBERG. I do. I see very little distinction as I have throughout my life in repressive regimes of the right or the left.

U.S. CREDIBILITY

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me a little ironic that in view of the current revelations of our own Executive Government branch's concept or the truth and veracity that we should presume to broadcast what this same executive branch is pleased to call the truth to foreign countries. It embarrasses me a bit in view of what is revealed daily on our own transmitters. On the other hand, we presume to take the truth to a variety of foreign people.

Mr. GOLDBERG. We do have a great problem in that regard. Our credibility as a nation and a government which believes in the unvarnished truth is sadly challenged.

Now, I have not seen the transcripts of recent VOA broadcasts recently. I would think it would add to the credibility of our country, as I think I indicated, if in the Voice of America plainly reported what is going on. I believe this would be a source of great strength to our country.

The CHAIRMAN. I had also in mind that in our hearings, in questioning some of the people who operate these radios, one of the principal items which they broadcast are official government statements. There

seemed to be a tendency to equate whatever is published and offered to the public by the government as the truth, and I do not think that puts us in a very credible light.

It had never occurred to me that every handout from an agency of this Government is the equivalent of the truth.

Mr. GOLDBERG. That is true, I think, of all governments.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. GOLDBERG. Governments, of course, are not notorious for giving all of the facts. That is why we have the first amendment safeguarding our free press and a system of checks and balances.

JUSTIFICATION FOR USING TAXPAYERS MONEY TO ENTERTAIN QUESTIONED

The CHAIRMAN. Just by the very nature of it these are self-serving propaganda. Actually, one further thought in that respect, is there any justification for using \$50 million of the taxpayers' money simply to entertain? Much of this is entertainment, especially on RIS. The justification was it has the greatest music programs and entertainment programs, highest quality of nearly any radio. That is fine, it is excellent, but I do not understand why the Germans do not pay for it, they are the principal beneficiaries. It just does not seem to me in the light of our interest and the purpose of our Government, that entertainment is a matter of priority. If we had nothing else to do with the money and we had a surplus running out of our ears, it might be a nice thing to bring pleasant programs to other people, but I cannot see that it is a very high priority to take \$50 million for this purpose.

STATE OF U.S. DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Mr. GOLDBERG. I agree with the chairman entirely. As I have already said I conceive the first obligation now is to set our domestic house in order. If we do so then we would be in much better shape through the world than we are today.

The CHAIRMAN. If our house were in order it would speak for itself and we would have no problem in having it advertised, as prominent as we are. If we were a small country like Chad or Nigeria, there might be some difficulty in getting the message across, but if the United States were performing properly there would be no need for this kind of propaganda.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I agree.

The CHAIRMAN. It seems to me the extreme urgency, much more this year than last, is perhaps a reaction from the recognition of the deplorable conditions within our own country and an effort to mislead somebody that is not as bad as it really is. We can in some way confuse the issue by propaganda and I do not think that is right.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF U.S. CORPORATIONS

Senator AIKEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may refresh your memory a little more, thinking back to the hearings we had well over a year ago, it was reported to us that \$38 million, I believe, was this Government's contribution at that time. Of that amount about \$2 million was contributed by American corporations, and you may recall, Mr. Chairman, that they flatly refused to tell us what corporations were contrib-

uting. They only said they were building business, it built business for them. I think we have a right to insist on knowing what American corporations are contributing to this fund or did contribute to it to build up their business over there. It is reported that Central European, Western European companies are building subsidiary plants in this country. And I think we are entitled to know what American corporations were making these contributions to stir up business in Central Europe before we take definite action. We have given them a year's time to do it. They have not done one thing that the committee asked to have done during that time. But I have a feeling that it would be very revealing if we knew what American corporations made the contributions.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I am surprised that that information is not available to this committee. I would think that those contributing would want it spread on the record; why should they not?

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Percy.

Senator PERCY. Thank you.

Senator AIKEN. They refused to have these contributions made public. They offered, as I recall it, to submit them to the chairman privately and confidentially and he refused to accept the information on those terms. The public has a right to know.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right. That is the creation of last year.

Senator AIKEN. I have an idea who they are.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Percy.

SOLZHENITSYN ARTICLE

Senator PERCY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, I should like to simply say that the Library of Congress has certified to us now that they have read the entire article, that this quotation and the reference it makes to Radio Liberty broadcasts is an accurate reflection.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I am glad to hear that.

CAMBODIAN BOMBING AND VETO OF SUPPLEMENTAL BILL

Senator PERCY. Second, Mr. Chairman, important as I think Radio Free Europe is, or Radio Liberty is, and I have six more questions to ask Ambassador Goldberg, with the indulgence of my senior colleagues on the committee, I wish to digress for the moment to ask of the three brilliant men of judgment and experience who are here this morning their opinions on the constitutional crisis over the bombing of Cambodia. We have the most serious confrontation that there may be for a long time between the Congress and the President of the United States. There is discussion that this is going to shut down the Government, that there will be payless paydays.

Our problem is this: We have passed the supplemental appropriation bill with the bombing halt amendment and it has been vetoed. We have now put the amendment on the debt limit bill, and according to the paper this morning Mr. Laird is reported to have said yesterday that it is going to be vetoed. And the leadership has said we are going to put this bombing halt amendment on every single bill, and I intend to vote for the amendment as it goes on every bill. But Mr. Laird is reported to have also said that he hopes a compromise can be worked

out, that he feels that if September 1—which is an acceptable date for the administration—is not acceptable to Congress, maybe a date sometime in August would be, and yesterday he mentioned August 15.

Since you are all negotiators of great experience, what difference does a bombing halt really make to the negotiations on Cambodia if the administration has now said it will accept a cutoff date and it could be August 15? Certainly, through Voice of America they are going to learn of the statement made by Mr. Laird yesterday, that the administration is just playing for 5 weeks now, and that the President could even sit on the debt limit bill until July 6 and sign it then. We are only talking about 5 weeks between then and August 15. What difference does it make to the negotiations whether we do it now or take a cutoff date of, say, August 15? Why should we have this confrontation?

Mr. GOLDBERG. The argument that the negotiating position of the United States is impaired by what the Senate did but that a September or even earlier date would not impair our negotiating ability simply does not wash. Our adversaries know precisely what the situation is. It is clear that whether it is today or 6 weeks from now there will be no further bombing. Therefore, I see no practical effect on the negotiations in either event.

More importantly, the time has long passed to make it crystal clear that there shall be no unconstitutional wars waged and this bombing is part of an unconstitutional war. There is only one body that can declare war, namely, the Congress.

I agree with you entirely. I do not see how the negotiating position of the United States is impaired one iota by the Senate action.

Senator PERCY. I thank you very much. In the interest of time, I will submit for the record the balance of my questions.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I will be glad to respond.

COMMENDATION OF WITNESS

Senator PERCY. I would simply like to comment that we are grateful for your being here. Your judgment is 99 and 44/100ths percent impeccable. In this case we differ. But I really feel that we can agree on certain things.

CREDIBILITY OF VOA

You say that the best propaganda is the unvarnished truth, the factual reporting of the Voice of America, but we do know from many reports that VOA is not as free from Government influence as Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, that these radios really have a separate identity even though it is known they are financed by the United States, that they really do have an independent way of getting at their reporting of what is going on in these countries. Even in your own testimony you have pointed out the problem of VOA, the very fact that is toning down the Watergate news.

I think it is a terrible mistake to put on the line the credibility of VOA, which we have worked so hard to build up, and then also deprive BBC of the use of our VOA studios. You cannot have it both ways, you have to have the trust of your audience, give the truth even when it hurts. That is what the BBC has done through the years, that

is what VOA has to do. I think your own testimony points out this problem in taking the chance that you can turn over this kind of broadcasting in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union to VOA.

RFE, RL ON WATERGATE

Mr. GOLDBERG. Senator, I would like to agree with you but I cannot. I would like, if the committee agrees, to have the transcripts of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe on Watergate to be included in this record. Let us see what they are saying. I think that would be very helpful in making an analysis of whether RFE and RL are freer to report developments than the Voice of America is.

Senator PERCY. We would be happy to do it.

Mr. GOLDBERG. That they are freer than the Voice of America.

[The information referred to follows:]

RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY SUBMISSIONS ON REPORTING
OF WATERGATE AFFAIR

(Supplied by Department of State)

RADIO FREE EUROPE

Events in the Watergate case and evaluation of them by the American and Western press have been reported by East European audiences by RFE in very much the same pattern as coverage of them by American domestic media, although more briefly because of the relatively lesser concern of East European listeners with these issues as well as limitations of air time.

The original Watergate break-in and events stemming from it were reported as they occurred. However, since the story reached its peak, early in April, news stories have been included almost daily in the hourly newscasts of RFE's five national services: they reported all significant public statements and all those major revelations from "reliable sources" which were accepted as credible and widely used by American media and press agencies.

For example, the following "lead stories" were compiled from press sources by RFE's Central Newsroom, and issued to the five broadcasting services for use in their newscasts, in the ten days May 15 through 24. (The press of events sometimes required broadcasting of as many as four "new leads" in the course of a single day):

May 15: Attorney General-designate Richardson tells Senate committee he will choose special prosecutor shortly; John Dean to appear at public hearing opening later in week; N.Y. Times reports Henry Kissinger said he was aware of past wiretaps; CIA deputy director reports White House aides sought his agency's help in "cover-up."

May 16: President proposes Congress set up special commission on campaign reforms; Securities and Exchange Commission chairman resigns after revelations about Vesco case; Senate Select Committee to open hearings May 17 and will question Dean, Ehrlichman, Haldeman and Mitchell.

May 17: Hearings open with nationwide television coverage; (later story) Senator Erwin says hearings will "spare no one, whatever his station in life." Odle, Kherli and policemen testify.

May 18: McCord scheduled to testify today; McCord tells committee he was pressured to keep silent: (later story) McCord says he was offered executive clemency if he pleaded guilty; White House spokesman calls this testimony "hearsay"; (further roundups of testimony); Richardson names Archibald Cox special prosecutor.

May 19: Further detail on Cox appointment; Mitchell tells press he will not be made "the fall guy."

May 20: (Sunday: no new developments)

May 21: Former CIA Director Helms testifies former White House aides tried to get agency to block investigation into campaign-fund sources.

May 22: Select Committee hearings resume (past week's developments reviewed); McCord says his lawyer tried to have him testify that Watergate

break-in was CIA operation; John Caulfield takes stand, says Dean instructed him to offer clemency to McCord; President issues press statement acknowledging apparent cover-up but denying he was involved, also reaffirms he will remain in office.

May 23: Select Committee will hear Caulfield again today; Caulfield says he felt "in my mind" that President knew about clemency offer, but has no direct knowledge; McCord's former attorney Gerald Alch says he was told client was "going after" President.

May 24: Hearings reopen, yesterday's events reviewed; Bernard Barker says he was looking for evidence of Cuban contributions to Democratic campaign funds; Senator McClellan says former FBI Acting Director Gray testified he warned the President that his aides were trying to involve FBI and CIA in a coverup.

To clarify and lend perspective to these news stories, all RFE services broadcast background analyses, weekly roundups, and selections of U.S. and Western press comments as events warranted. For the three months of April 1 through June 30, 1973 these have averaged three programs per week, totaling 14½ minutes, to each of RFE's five audience countries, or about 9/10 of one percent of all original programming other than newscasts. (At peak periods this percentage ran about twice as high.) Of these background programs, about one third were press reviews which rounded up the editorial reactions of (among others): *the Baltimore Sun*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *Philadelphia Inquirer*, *Washington Post*, *Wall Street Journal*, *London Daily Telegraph*, *Die Welt* (Hamburg); *The Times* (London); *New York Times*; *New York Daily News*; *Cleveland Plain Dealer*; *le Figaro* (Paris); *Guardian* (London); *Daily Mail* (London); *Financial Times* (London); *Neue Zuercher Zeitung* (Zurich); *Sueddeutsche Zeitung* (Munich); *Newsweek*; *La Nation* (Paris); *Time l'Aurore* (Paris); *Washington Evening Star*; *National Review*; *U.S. News & World Report*; *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*; *The Economist* (London); *le Monde* (Paris); *Il Messaggero* (Rome).

Both news stories and background programs included reports of expressions of concern in the United States about the possible impact of the charges and revelations on public confidence in the Presidency and the government in general. But RFE analyses and press reviews also noted the separation of powers among the executive, legislative and judicial branches of the U.S. government and the role which this was playing in examining and if necessary correcting malfunctions—as well as the role played by a free press in the same process.

Both these points would, of course, not be lost on audiences in East Europe, where such mechanisms do not exist. However, they were also made directly in one RFE program to Czechoslovakia, which replied to a letter from a listener protesting that RFE was giving too much attention to the Watergate case. The program said, in part:

"We all would prefer not to have to talk and write about Watergate; and what we would like best, of course, would be if there had been no Watergate at all . . . But happen it did; and Watergate will not go away just because we stop talking about it. Because, whether we like it or not, in these days and weeks Watergate is overshadowing everything that is happening in American politics; and whatever happens in American politics has an impact, direct or indirect, upon the international scene . . . Well meant advice, such as 'let's not talk about it, or at least not so much', does not absolve us of our duty to report things as they are and to try to explain them. . . .

"Should we pretend that Watergate is merely one of America's marginal domestic problems, which has nothing to do with what this station is all about? The answer is that we cannot and will not do that. There are many good reasons for it, but one above all: From the multitude of facts and events which co-determine the course of this world, we cannot choose those that please us and ignore the others—as has been the practice, for example, in the Communist media. Besides, we believe that we are addressing an adult audience, capable of its own judgment, which is able to sort out and evaluate information—provided of course that the required information is made available to it. . . .

"This matter could be approached with the cynicism that is sometimes present in some European commentaries: there always have been scandals, and always will be, but the world goes on. Or it could be seen through the eyes of a Communist politician, for whom things such as bugging or wiretapping belong among the normal means of governing, and who will never understand how they could become a public scandal.

"But America does not see it that way . . . What would probably never have seen the light of day in the closed society of a totalitarian state, and what in many other countries might have been merely shrugged off, came as a shock to America—and almost automatically started the machinery of the democratic process which is to make sure that, first, the whole truth of the matter will be fully ascertained and made public, and that, second, legal measures will be taken to ensure that a thing like this will never happen again.

"The chief instruments of that democratic process are the independent judiciary, independent legislature—and independent press, with all its advantages and drawbacks. And so, to report on Watergate and its consequences certainly does not mean 'throwing dirt' on America; on the contrary, it means describing America as it goes through a cleansing process. And it is not, as so often in another part of the world, a purge ordered and directed from above, with a pre-ordained outcome, but a spontaneous catharsis taking place before the eyes of of the entire public. Its final consequence cannot be predicted at this time; the American position may be temporarily weakened in this or that respect; but America as a whole cannot but emerge strengthened in the end—with a new reassertion of the moral principles which its founders established almost 200 years ago.

"This is why we are talking, and will go on talking, about Watergate."

RADIO LIBERTY

Soviet media coverage

From the first news of the Watergate break-in last summer up to the present, the little coverage of the affair carried by the Soviet media has emphasized the long-familiar propaganda theme of "typical dirty tricks" in American politics. After the new year and especially by April when reports appeared to the effect that the Watergate affair might be a much broader attempt at political sabotage which implicated high White House officials, Soviet media coverage did not expand into the kind of anti-American propaganda barrage that might have been expected. Indeed, when James Reston in a January 17 article expressed fears for the whole American political system and insisted that this was not just an extension of the normal "dirty tricks" of American political campaigns, concluding with the hope that open Congressional hearings broadcast on television would enable the American people to judge for themselves, the column was reprinted in *Literaturnaya Gazeta* with these suggestions rewritten to emphasize that after all the whole matter was just normal political "dirty tricks" and that the only action to be taken was for politicians to increase their security precautions.

The media have continued to shy away from the complications of the story and have only in isolated articles briefly named a number of personalities involved, avoiding as well the problem of explaining aspects of the American political system that might contradict the standard picture in Soviet media or reflect unfavorably on the Soviet system. Such incidents as the termination of the Ellsberg-Russo trial were reported without any indication as to their link with Watergate.

Primarily, however, Soviet media coverage, reinforced by General Secretary Brezhnev's public statements to journalists, suggests a clear effort to avoid embarrassing either Nixon or Brezhnev around the time of the Soviet leader's visit to the United States in June, so important for the policy of détente and expanded trade. When Nixon's first statement showing concern on the subject on April 17 was reported in *Pravda* two days later, there was no mention that this was a reversal of his earlier position. Nixon's lengthy May 22 statement was actually translated and reprinted by *Za Rubezhom (Abroad)* with extensive cuts and accompanied by an introductory paragraph implying that Nixon's words are in answer to irresponsible press reports. The text as reprinted omits any references to Nixon's fears in the past that leaks of official information would damage his negotiating position.

Radio Liberty coverage

Radio Liberty's broadcasts on Watergate attempt to approximate what an uncensored free press within the USSR might provide the Soviet people. While Soviet internal affairs and international events of particular interest to Soviet listeners are Radio Liberty's special focus, growing worldwide interest in Watergate began to be reflected in broadcasts in April, both to fill in the gaps left by

Soviet censorship and to satisfy audience curiosity and avert potential bewilderment.

Without overwhelming the listener with blow-by-blow reports, which might also curtail coverage of news closer to him, Radio Liberty's selective news coverage and press reviews on Watergate aim at giving the Soviet listener an accurate understanding of the main elements of the developing story in a way comprehensible to him. Since April 16, Watergate appeared in Radio Liberty newscasts, repeated hourly, at least every second day with as many as six news changes on days of fast-breaking events. In an average of two original feature broadcasts a week, Radio Liberty has reviewed the world press and used discussions and analyses by New York and Washington correspondents to relate events to the Soviet experience specifically. Some examples of such coverage follow:

A press review on May 2 quoted from a *New York Times* article commenting on Nixon's Watergate speech which stated that removal of some persons from their positions was inevitable and much more remains to be done. The newspaper feels that Nixon's decision was reached too late. An article in *Die Welt* was quoted as noting that the Watergate scandal weakened Nixon's authority and increased Congressional power. This may affect politics in the U.S. profoundly.

In another feature the Watergate crisis was considered in the light of writings published only in the West, by such Soviet dissidents as the historian Roy Medvedev and the nuclear physicist Andrei Sakharov, on national security precautions in the Soviet Union.

The main points of Nixon's May 22 statement were reported, including Nixon's reference to his concern over security leaks and his express desire to see that justice is served in the investigation of Watergate. Brief background information on the publication of the Pentagon Papers was given as an illustration of a security leak to which Nixon was referring.

In a feature reviewing events in Latin America, a section was devoted to the varying reaction to the Watergate affair there. It points out that the more strict the censorship in a given country, the scantier the information available to Latin American readers. The feature poses the question, "Why does the U.S. press feel obligated to report Watergate in detail?" and goes on to give the answer of a number of Latin American papers that this is a manifestation of open public debate on every topic of social life in the United States.

Several round table discussions have been presented:

1. A discussion of four current so-called political scandals in the bourgeois world, including the Watergate affair, the case of the call girls and two high officials in England, the Steiner case in West Germany and the telephone tap exposé in Italy.

2. A discussion with three participants, two of whom are recent young arrivals from the USSR already somewhat familiar with the American scene. The feature cites a criticism of unbridled attack against President Nixon which appeared in the *London Times*, June 5. It goes on to note how little information Soviet listeners have been able to receive from their own media and points out that some observers trace the paucity of coverage to 1) Brezhnev's visit to the U.S. and 2) the fact that Watergate is an illustration of openness of public debate in the U.S. One of the participants in the discussion expressed opposition to the "excesses" of publicity, while the other posed questions on the use of bugging devices by Soviet secret police on Soviet dissenters. A translation is appended.

A number of broadcasts have featured former Soviet citizens explaining and discussing the separation of powers between executive, legislative and judicial branches of the U.S. Government in the context of the Senate Watergate hearings and grand jury investigations.

Some broadcasts have discussed the conflict between the investigation by the Senate Watergate Committee and the grand jury investigation in the light of the U.S. Bill of Rights, which guarantees both freedom of speech and press and the right to a fair trial. In this context the facets of U.S. law which allow one to receive immunity from prosecution for testimony are also discussed.

Finally, reports have been made on the response of the American public to Watergate, as shown in letters to editors, the results of a Gallup poll on U.S. opinion on Presidential involvement in the affair, as well as a *Washington Post* report on Congressional opinion on the possibility of impeaching the President.

(Translation From Russian—Broadcast by Radio Liberty, June 13/14, 1973.)

TOPICS OF DISCUSSION No. 85

THE WATERGATE AFFAIR

YURASOV: This is Vladimir Yurasov. Together with me in our studio are two regular Radio Liberty staff members—Victor Lavrov and Victor Kabachnik. They both only recently left the Soviet Union and are now residing permanently in the United States. The subject of our talk today is the so-called Watergate case which in the past few months has literally stirred up the entire United States. And not only the U.S. The entire world press is full of details concerning this case. In the U.S. the case has reached the point when on television, over the radio, even among Congressmen and governors of various states, there is talk of the President's resignation. On June 5 the London *Times*, in a lengthy editorial, criticized such attacks against President Nixon on the part of the major American newspapers, the *Washington Post* and the *New York Times*, which, though the legal investigation is not over yet, are publishing an enormous amount of various materials connected with the Watergate case and are making President Nixon—to quote the London *Times*—a victim of the "Washington variant of lynch law."

In the Soviet Union the press has published almost nothing on the Watergate case. Thus if Soviet citizens know anything about it, it is mostly from foreign broadcasts. According to some foreign observers this hushing up of the Watergate affair and of the passions which have flared up around it is due to Brezhnev's forthcoming visit to the U.S. where, in his talks with President Nixon he is counting on obtaining favorable conditions for deliveries to the Soviet Union worth millions of dollars. Other observers feel that the hushing up of the Watergate affair in the official Soviet press is connected with the Party leadership's unwillingness for Soviet Citizens to become fully aware, through the Watergate example, of American democracy in action, in particular of the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, the right of people to know everything the government is doing, even in its most secret dealings.

Today so many events are circling around the Watergate affair—so many rumors, documents, testimonies of witnesses, statements by officials, newspaper editorials and so on and so forth—that let us recapitulate, going back to when it all first started.

During the pre-election campaign, before the presidential election last year, in the main headquarters of the election committee of the Democratic party, located in Washington in a building called the Watergate, several persons were detained and arrested for attempting to install electronic wiretapping equipment designed to listen to the conversations of the staff members of this committee. These persons were tried and convicted for violating the law. During the legal investigation and following it those arrested testified that they were acting on instructions from several leading officials of the Committee for the Re-election of the candidate of the Republican party, President Nixon. By that time, by the time of the trial investigation, some of the officials of the Committee for the Re-election of President Nixon already occupied prominent positions in the government, several were working in the White House close to the President. It became known that some of them had tried to prevent further investigation, limiting the case to the conviction of those who were actively involved and took the rap. Prominent representatives of the opposing Democratic party, major newspapers, television networks, even some members of the Republican party, demanded a further full-scale investigation of the Watergate case. For this purpose a special Senate commission was set up, and many of its hearings and testimonies of witnesses are televised all over the country. At the same time, the case is also being investigated by a federal grand jury. The government—the Justice Department—has appointed a special prosecutor, a professor of law from Harvard University, whose candidacy has been approved by Democratic Senators and who has already begun his investigation. President Nixon, also, has conducted his own inquiry which resulted in the firing from the White House staff of several of the closest presidential aides and in the resignation of the Attorney General and other prominent government officials. It is becoming increasingly evident that the opposing side wants to prove that President Nixon knew of the wiretapping attempt during the pre-election campaign and that the attempt to cover up the Watergate affair was undertaken with his knowledge.

The other side feels that the Watergate case is being deliberately blown out of proportion for the sake of party and other interests, that it is damaging to the prestige of the executive branch of the U.S., damaging to the entire country, and not only domestically, but abroad as well. In one word, America today is split into two camps, and the division is not always along party lines.

As I said, the Soviet press is covering up the Watergate affair. In comparison with the world press, the Soviet press publishes almost nothing about the case. In my opinion, the citizens of the Soviet Union have a right to know about it since everything is better understood through comparison. Only recently both of you were living in the Soviet Union, now you live in the U.S. and know the Watergate affair in all its details, as do all those who live in America. What do you think of this matter? Let's start with you, please, Victor Lavrov.

LAVROV: The so-called Watergate case is so complex, has grown so much in depth and scope, has so affected all mass information media that it is simply impossible to form a clear opinion about it. But the fact remains that persons working for the Republican Committee for the Re-election to a second term of President Nixon took part in the Watergate break-in. If the 1972 Republican presidential candidate had not held the reins of executive power, i.e. had not been the President, those persons caught red-handed at the site of the crime would have been tried by a regular federal court. The American press would have briefly complained about the Republicans, and the whole thing would have ended there. However, those apprehended on June 17 in the Watergate complex were not only committing a criminal act, they were not merely working for the party of the candidate at the forthcoming elections. From them, it seemed, the line led to the top of the U.S. executive branch, i.e. to Nixon's ruling apparatus in the White House and, as some allege, even to President Nixon. And that is the reason why for almost a year now a legal and public investigation has been taking place and still has not ended, and the investigation is not limited only to the break-in last June at the Watergate. Under investigation are the activities of the White House apparatus connected with national security. For the American Congress, the press and the public actively aim at preventing a future President from going beyond the limits of his powers, preventing a President and his appointed White House apparatus from using their widespread powers in violation of rights and liberties provided by the American Constitution.

While the investigation by the Senate special commission is continuing and until the trial of the Watergate participants is over, it is difficult to say who is right and who is guilty. For instance, is McCord—a worker of the Republican Committee for the Re-election of the President—guilty, for legal and moral reasons? McCord was caught on June 17 while installing wiretapping equipment in the headquarters of the Democratic party at the Watergate. He could very well have been told that the installation of hidden microphones had been ordered from above for reasons of national security, and I think that those who express extreme opinions on the subject—either privately or in American newspapers—are wrong, i.e. no matter how predominant was the number of radically inclined elements within the Democratic party before the 1972 presidential elections, the break-in at the Democratic headquarters at Watergate cannot be condoned, at least not from the point of view of the American Constitution and American legislation based on it. Equally wrong, in my opinion, are those who demand an immediate Senate trial of President Nixon in order to publicly reprimand him, to pass a vote of no-confidence. At the present stage, when it has absolutely not been proven that the President of the United States has severely violated the U.S. Constitution, such demands are, at the least, irresponsible.

However, for someone who has lived most of his life in the Soviet Union, the legal and public campaign in the Watergate case is quite significant. More than any other event it has demonstrated the effectiveness of the American separation of power structure, where the President and his apparatus cannot act as they choose, cannot turn the constitutional rights of the American citizen and the American public into a hollow sound. If an attempt is made, or if it is suspected, as happened in the Watergate case, the U.S. Congress, the American press and the American justice apparatus—all independent of the presidential apparatus—immediately engage in a heated campaign. As in any such campaign, there may be elements of sensationalism, personal dislike of the President, irresponsible state-

ments. But for me the essence of the Watergate affair is the fact that it is one more guarantee that a one-man dictatorship is impossible in the United States—no matter who he may be, the President or another high-ranking person. As long as such a stormy case as the Watergate is possible in America, the U.S.A. will never become a police state.

YURASOV: Thank you, Victor, thank you very much. And now—Victor Kabachnik. What do you think of the Watergate affair?

KABACHNIK: Well, if one is to speak of one's initial reactions to the Watergate case—it was last year, before the presidential elections, I can only say that I just did not attach any particular importance to this case. That, of course, was due, in the first place, to my psychology as a former Soviet man. You understand: someone was planning to wiretap someone else's conversations—big deal! And secondly, observing the pre-election campaigns of the major presidential candidates, seeing and hearing how the American press pounces on any, often even unconfirmed, information about the candidates, I dismissed the Watergate affair as yet another excess of the pre-election struggle. And I certainly could never have imagined that the affair would assume such inordinate proportions. Now, when the case is daily being discussed in detail in the American press, over the radio and on television—and not only in America, but one can boldly say all over the world, with the possible exception of the Communist countries—it has caught my interest also. I'll repeat—having lived over a year in the U.S. and having seen with my own eyes what a democratic society is, I still have not fully managed to rid myself of my Soviet complex. And if the Watergate affair is to be considered in this aspect, it has had on me—let me say without exaggeration—an enormous impression. No less, I think, than the impression any Soviet citizen would have of, say, the public arrest and trial of KGB men for the installation of wiretapping devices in, say, the apartment of one of the dissenters. And for me the fact alone that the Watergate case is being investigated represents the best proof of the existence of truly democratic liberties in the country where government officials are put on trial, and what is especially important for me, on public trial, for participating in an attempt to listen in on their political opponents.

And, of course, I am in complete agreement with the majority of the American public which is demanding a thorough and impartial investigation of this affair, with just sentences for all those who violated the law, regardless of their position. And I am simply delighted by the fact that the American information media are doing the utmost to give the necessary publicity to the Watergate case. But unfortunately, as they say, there are two sides to every medal. When I spoke of my admiration for American journalists and commentators, I had in mind two of the most important principles of their activity—*glasnost'* and objectivity. But in reporting on the Watergate case, in my opinion, quite a few journalists and commentators violate these principles, especially the second one, objectivity. I would even say that abuses of freedom of the press are taking place. I have the impression that in reporting on the Watergate affair many representatives of the press exhibit a bias of rather definite character. To my mind, this bias can be explained by their political position. All of them are opponents of President Nixon and to this day they cannot gracefully accept their candidate's defeat in the presidential elections. And what is particularly unpleasant to me, personally, is that journalists sometimes violate one of the basic laws—the one on presumption of innocence—by prematurely accusing, in this case President Nixon, of illegal actions. In my evaluation of this I am in full agreement with the London *Times* which, Vladimir Ivanovich, you quoted at the beginning of our talk.

Sometimes it seems to me that the author of a newspaper article is not so much interested in the Watergate case itself as in passionately seeking out facts compromising for the President, moreover often even unconfirmed facts, and that smacks more of unlawful methods of political struggle than of the objectivity and impartiality of journalistic work. But I shall not exaggerate, or it may lead me, too, away from impartiality. Despite of what I said before, the American reader and television viewer enjoys every possibility of receiving full information on the Watergate affair, without necessarily agreeing with the opinion of one or another of the commentators. And in conclusion I wish to stress that, no matter how the Watergate case may end, and in spite of the excesses to which some journalists may have recurred, for me, a man who grew up and was educated in the Soviet Union, the main thing is that in this struggle of different opinions, in these open arguments the American people, in the end, the American people still finds out the true state of affairs and can not only reach its own independent conclusion, but can also pass its own verdict. I mean the elections, from which the

President as well as each Senator and each Congressman are dependent. For in the end in America the last word belongs to the American people.

YURASOV: Thank you, Victor. I think that our listeners in the Soviet Union were interested in learning your opinion of the Watergate affair which has stirred up the entire United States—the opinion of two recent citizens of the Soviet Union, now living in the United States.

In conclusion I wish to say that there are many people in the Soviet Union who, despite the hushing up of democratic processes as they exist in other countries, despite propaganda distortions, still understand what democracy in action really represents. For example, the Soviet historian Roy Medvedev writes in his book on socialist democracy, I quote: "Of bourgeois democracy we are used to speak scornfully as of an incomplete democracy, illusory, false, declarative and so on. Such an approach is unilateral, too biased, and thus erroneous. The aggregate of political and social institutions and mechanisms which constitutes the system of bourgeois democracy is not a fiction." Thus writes Roy Medvedev. And the Watergate affair in America, no matter how one assesses it, nevertheless proves the truth of Roy Medvedev's words.

This concludes the discussion of the Watergate affair. Participating in the discussion were Victor Lavrov and Victor Kabachnik. This is Vladimir Yurasov.

Senator PERCY. We are happy to insert such transcripts. I think we ought to lay it right out and let Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe respond. We are also going to audit and reaudit to make certain that never again do we get into the alleged excesses of the fifties. With all of the audits so far made there has been no evidence whatsoever that in recent years they have engaged in that kind of broadcasting.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I agree they have improved themselves immeasurably from everything I have heard. I share your concern that the Voice of America should tell about the mores in our own eyes, namely, Watergate. I would like to see what Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe are saying on the same subject. I am sure the committee would.

Senator PERCY. I thank the witness very much and I will put the rest of my questions in the record and send them to Ambassador Goldberg.

Mr. GOLDBERG. And I will be glad to respond in writing.

PURPOSE OF RFE, RL PRETENDING TO BE INDEPENDENT

The CHAIRMAN. I only want to say it is my understanding from considerable study of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe that the purpose of their pretending to be independent, and you referred to this independence, is so they could be more offensive in their attacks upon the various governments, and the U.S. Government wouldn't be responsible. Even before last year's hearing, the evidence is quite clear that the policy was always held in line subject to check by the representative of the CIA or the Government, and it still is, but they do give them a freer reign. They can make statements that we wouldn't want to be responsible for officially in the State Department, because they are offensive to the respective government. That was its main objective and purpose in pretending it was independent. It was all a fraud but, nevertheless, that is the excuse. Now they say it is no longer independent, they have destroyed that reason for having it, as you have already pointed out. If it is going to be now an official fully funded government operation, it is certainly going to be responsible to the guidance and restraints of the government, and if we are sincere—this always raises the question, this type of operation, just as the Jackson amendment, in my opinion, raises

the question of sincerity of our Government in these gestures of reconciliation with Russia. If you were a Russian and we go through all of the sermons we did last week in which I and others participated, then you go home and there is a resumption of the same kind of criticisms that have traditionally been leveled by Radio Liberty, what would you think? Do they really mean it or not, or is there a change even in the weather?

POLICY TOWARD TRUTHFUL OPERATION IN BROADCASTING

Mr. GOLDBERG. My essential point is this: We are not restrained and should not be restrained from telling the truth in the Voice of America about ourselves or about any other country. If we tell the truth, and there is no reason our Government should not tell the truth, in our foreign broadcasts, BBC, as Senator Percy properly said, is well known for doing it, no nation can properly take offense, and it will not militate against détente. The basic question is: Why do we need a proliferation of broadcasting agencies if our policy is to conduct a truthful operation in our Voice of America broadcasting?

The CHAIRMAN. When the truth is so unpalatable, as it is today, why spend \$50 million to make it even more? It will surely get through from the other agencies we have mentioned. It is not going to be hidden by Radio Free Europe or Voice of America. All I say is, why spend \$50 million? The only time you could justify that is if the truth was palatable, if it was complimentary, if we did put our house in order. Presently I can see no excuse for spending money to advertise what goes on today.

Mr. GOLDBERG. You remember what our great friend, Paul Douglas, said, you don't have to be profligate to be a liberal.

The CHAIRMAN. That is right.

Mr. GOLDBERG. I agree with him.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Justice. You have been very patient.

The next witness this morning is the Honorable Averell Harriman, who is former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, and former Governor of the State of New York. We welcome you, Governor, very much; we appreciate your coming.

STATEMENT OF W. AVERELL HARRIMAN, FORMER U.S.
AMBASSADOR TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. HARRIMAN. I would like to say first, if I may, that I wish to congratulate you and the members of the committee for the overwhelming support given to Senate Resolution 67.

SENATE RESOLUTION 67

It was my privilege to testify a few weeks ago before your subcommittee on disarmament in support of the resolution. The time is ripe for the proposed Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty to end all nuclear testing, including underground. Furthermore, the resolution proposes a most practical, effective way for the President to initiate negotiations by announcing that the United States would refrain from testing as long as the Soviets showed similar restraint.

I earnestly hope the Senate will approve Senate Resolution 67 by an impressive majority.

S. 1914 SUPPORTED

This morning, I am again grateful to the committee for the opportunity to support the International Broadcasting bill, S. 1914, with its authorization of funds to finance adequately Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

This bill would carry out the principal recommendations of the report of the Presidential Study Commission on International Radio Broadcasting.

I strongly endorse the conclusions and recommendations of this report. I have enormous respect for the chairman of the Commission, Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower. I know no one in the country in whose judgment on this subject I would have greater confidence. The four other members of the Commission are also unusually well qualified.

My own experience with negotiations with the Soviet Union and other Communist countries, covering a period of nearly 50 years, in the middle twenties I was involved with a rather large mining operation conducted in the middle twenties and I went to the Soviet Union at that time and saw the leaders at that time. As I say, my own experience leads me to strongly support their findings. The report emphasizes the importance of the continuation of the flow of accurate information only available to the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe through the Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe broadcasts. This is information of fact within the country as well as fact from without.

INFORMATION BROADCASTED CONTRIBUTES TO IMPROVED RELATIONS

The information provided by the broadcasts contribute, in my opinion, on balance, substantially to the improvement of relations between our countries. Of course, they annoy the leaders of these countries who are doing everything in their power to prevent their people from gaining the facts by the control of all means of communications. However, regardless of statements to the contrary, I am convinced that the Kremlin and other Communist leaders are substantially influenced by public opinion in their countries. This is why they wish to control information reaching their people. The more the people know the more difficult it is for them to prevent judgments to be formed and demands to be made which may or may not be in accordance with their desires. Information about subjects within and without these countries which would affect the peoples' lives have an influence on local public opinion. Today one of the important sources of this information comes from the Radio Liberty broadcasts. It is true that they are severely jammed in Moscow and in other large communities but in the dachas and in the environs where many people go for weekends, and in other parts of the country, these broadcasts are widely received. In addition, in a highly censored country, information flows quickly by word of mouth, replaying recordings, and otherwise. There are endless examples of the failure of the Soviet Union to inform its citizens of important events. As one example, I am told that no accurate information has yet been supplied regard-

ing the grain purchases in the United States, which makes it possible for the Soviet Union to maintain the peoples' diet. I am sure the committee is well aware of many other examples.

RUSSIAN DESIRE TO TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES

Among the reasons for the present desire of the Kremlin to improve relations with the United States is to expand trade in order to be able to meet the demands of the Russian people. These demands are increased by knowledge of what is being denied them, by bureaucratic inefficiency within the Soviet Union and vast sums spent on military and international policies.

ADHERENCE TO POLICY GUIDELINES FOR BROADCASTS

One of the recommendations of the Commission which, I think, deserves special attention, is that the policy guidelines for the broadcasts adopted last year be strictly adhered to. In the past, particularly under Secretary of State Dulles' "liberation" concepts. May I say I debated in 1952 with Mr. Dulles in that campaign the liberation questions and I pointed out to him that if he continued that liberation policy the lives of brave men and women would be on his conscience. However, he did not abandon that position. It had the impression that the broadcast included dangerously provocative material. I may be wrong. I am sure that in the intervening years this has been stamped out. I disapprove of any such material being put on any such broadcast.

DOUBLE STANDARD FOR REPORTING TRUTH

The CHAIRMAN. If I may interrupt there to say in view of our Government's reputation for the accuracy of the information it gives our people, why do you think they are so accurate in giving accurate information to foreign people? Do they have a double standard, they tell the truth to foreigners and deception to our own people.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I couldn't hear you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I don't understand your statement on page 4, you said that the broadcasts stick to factual news and are accurate to other countries, in view of the—

Mr. HARRIMAN. Could I finish my statement? I think I explain it. I think I explain it as I go on.

The CHAIRMAN. OK.

SAFEGUARD FOR IMPLEMENTING PRINCIPLES OF BROADCAST GUIDELINES

Mr. HARRIMAN. However, for my part, I am satisfied the broadcasts should stick to factual news of matters, within and without the countries involved, of interest and concern to the people. Critical analysis is, of course, appropriate but this should not be strident in tone as it is counterproductive. I would hope that the organizational structure proposed in S. 1914 would provide appropriate safeguards in implementing the principles of the guidelines in the Commission's report.

I emphasize the importance of this as it will insure the effectiveness of the broadcasts and will reduce the criticisms of the governments involved and the members of the Communist parties in those countries. In fact, I have been told that the lower echelons of the Communist officials in these countries welcome the information that comes to them through the broadcasts of actions taken by the politburos which they would otherwise not know. In fact, I believe it is to be true that information that comes out on these broadcasts, Radio Liberation, Radio Free Europe, tends to force the governments to give out more information themselves.

MUTUAL REDUCTION IN BROADCASTING ADVOCATED

I am, and have consistently been, for mutual actions to reduce tensions and improve relations with Communist countries. I believe in mutual reduction of arms but not unilateral disarmament. That is not that I am for reducing our permanent budget, I think it is too high in itself. By the same token, I am for mutual reduction in broadcasting but not unilateral reduction. Today the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries have far greater activities in broadcasting throughout the world, spreading inaccurate and provocative propaganda. It would be unwise for us to unilaterally abandon a most important activity as is the case with the broadcasting under consideration, unless there was some international understanding on the free flow of information to all countries and the abandonment of communist aggressive propaganda activities.

IMPORTANCE OF FLOW OF INFORMATION TO COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

We are today expending some \$80 billion for military security and it would be, in my judgment, the acme of folly to fail to authorize the relatively small sums needed for these broadcasts and thereby reduce the flow of information to the peoples of the Communist countries which, to me, is one of the most important protections to our national security. An ignorant people will be easily led by Kremlin and other politburos. An informed opinion is far more difficult to dominate. From my experience, even Stalin paid attention to public opinion within the Soviet Union. Evidence is clear that today Kremlin leaders must pay greater attention to their public opinion.

I firmly believe in the principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, including article 19, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. The Soviet leaders do not in practice adhere to this declaration although they claim to support it; I believe have subscribed to it. Until they do, it is to our vital national interest, and in fact peace in the world, that the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are given access, as provided, to "information and ideas * * * regardless of frontiers."

There are somewhat greater freedoms in the Soviet Union today than under Stalin and I am satisfied that this trend will inevitably accelerate with increasing demands from the Soviet people, which the leaders will not be able to disregard. However, the more the Soviet people know, the more they will demand. We must recognize and respect the amazing job the Bolsheviks did in converting, in a short time, a relatively illiterate people into an almost completely literate population. With

literacy comes a demand for more information. This is evident in the extraordinary avidity of the Soviet people for books and other reading matter. There is no doubt in my mind this literate people will continue to demand more information, particularly as they understand how much is still being withheld from them. Intellectual leaders within the Soviet Union are demanding more freedom of expression. We should heed the call for help from men like Solzhenitsyn in the continuing of the broadcasts and not turn our backs on them.

S. 1914 ENDORSED

This broadcasting activity should not be a part of Voice of America or under State Department or under CIA. It is a unique operation and should be independently administered as proposed in S. 1914.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I endorse S. 1914 and earnestly hope that the provision for financing of \$50,300,000 for fiscal year 1974 be authorized in full. Taking into account the devaluation of the dollar, it would be self-defeating to starve the broadcasting activities by providing a lesser amount. During the course of the year, I would hope that with the assistance from Western European countries a program of modernization of the facilities could be developed.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Governor Harriman.

I will yield to the sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Illinois.

Senator AIKEN. I have no questions. We are running behind time and we want to hear two more witnesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Senator from Illinois.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Harriman, we again, all of us, thank you for being here.

CONTENTION THAT RADIO LIBERTY IS RELIC OF COLD WAR

You have had many decades of experience in dealing with the leaders of the Soviet Union. Do you think we would improve the prospect of accommodation with the U.S.S.R. by accepting the contention that Radio Liberty is a relic of the cold war?

Mr. HARRIMAN. No, I don't think it is a relic of the cold war. The universal declaration of human rights is not a part of the cold war. A flow of information across boundaries is not part of the cold war. And I don't consider it any part of it. Giving information is not part of the cold war.

I agree with the chairman in his statement we should not conduct propaganda, but giving factual information and analysis of it, as is done at the present time, particularly under the guidelines adopted, is quite a different matter than conducting a cold war. I would be opposed to anything approaching propaganda activities conducted by these two stations.

Senator PERCY. I most certainly agree with you and that was the purpose of our audit a year or so ago.

RADIO LIBERTY CONTRIBUTES INDIRECTLY TO REDUCTION IN TENSION

Then you would say actually that Radio Liberty contributes indirectly to a reduction in tension? Is that a logical conclusion?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I believe, I think in spite of what the chairman has said, I don't think fully has understood or fully given thought to it. If the Soviet people are not given information about what is going on within their own country, the denial of information that is given to them, and they are reached in this manner, it will tend to give the leaders greater opportunity to do what they wish and will increase the dangers of confrontation. One of the things that is desirable about the recent discussions, I regret they didn't go further between the President and Mr. Brezhnev, was that the Soviet people were given more information about the United States and were encouraged to believe that we could get along better. That is an important step forward. I want to emphasize in my statement the importance of public opinion. Most people don't understand that public opinion does have an influence on the leaders of the Communist countries and I am satisfied that the more public opinion, more information public opinion has in these countries the more their desires will be forced upon the leaders.

PUBLIC OPINION IN COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Senator PERCY. Then you are really denying the factuality of statements that public opinion is simply not a factor in Communist countries and that we are wasting our time trying to provide information to the broad masses of people in those countries.

Mr. HARRIMAN. I would deny that and there is evidence that even members of the Communist Party who are on the lower echelons welcome these in the Soviet Union or in the other countries because they get information from this source which they couldn't get otherwise. What their leaders are doing and what the Politburos' policies are. Many of those decisions and policies are never announced to them and this undoubtedly, much as I respect everything that Justice Goldberg said about the need for truth and Voice of America, as I understand it, we are appropriating about \$9 million in Voice of America to be directed toward these countries whereas \$50 million is included, and this is the area, Russia and Eastern Europe is the area of danger from the leaders, of these present leaders of these countries. Now if you wanted to add \$50 million to the Voice of America there might be something in the argument that it could do it, but I think it would change the Voice of America and I don't think it should be involved, and I also think that this bill which is before you sets up an independent commission so that the whim of the White House, as we have seen affecting the Voice of America, could not be applied to this independent commission. So these two broadcasting operations will be quite separate and to some extent under supervision of the Congress so they could be kept apart from any misuse by special interests that might be in any administration.

Senator PERCY. Is public opinion much more important in the Soviet Union today than it was in the days of Stalin?

Mr. HARRIMAN. Yes, sir.

Senator PERCY. Can you tell us why? What has transpired in the meantime to make public opinion a more powerful and effective factor in the Soviet life?

Mr. HARRIMAN. Even in Stalin's time he had to pay attention to public opinion and at one time he told me he looked upon it as an at-

tempt to avoid revolutionary actions. But in Stalin's time there was a far more rigid secret police watching much more rigidly what everybody was saying and doing and since his death the leaders are unwilling to have that continue. Khrushchev himself told me in the latter days of Stalin's life even members of the Politburo couldn't go to see, if they were called to see Stalin were worried they might never see their families again, and he said no one could work under that kind of terror and they abandoned the one-man control of the secret police. As a result of that there has been greater independence in general and then also as the people became more educated and as the local authorities, even the Communist Party became more interested in seeing things are done for their communities, there has become a greater fusion of power and greater influence on the part of the central committees as against the Politburo itself. So that I think it is fair to say that much progress has been made. There is tremendous progress still to be made and I do believe these two operations will contribute to a further demand for information on the part of the people.

Senator PERCY. We have just had a remarkable opportunity to observe the attitude of Mr. Brezhnev toward, and his appreciation of, the importance of American public opinion. He has made a tremendous appeal to the American public and to the Congress, and he spoke with this committee at a luncheon headed by the chairman, in terms which show he recognizes the power that, as he called it, the parliament has in this country. It was quite amazing. I suppose if Stalin had ever come to this country, there would have been no media reporting back, when Khrushchev was here there was very little, but during Brezhnev's visit we were inundated with Russian reporters. They were in the corridors of the Capitol and the Senate office buildings.

They poured into our offices to record interviews for broadcasts to be sent back. Telephone calls came in from other media people in Moscow. Mr. Brezhnev was merchandising his visit back home and presumably there was an appetite for the coverage.

EFFECT OF RL, VOA BROADCASTS ON COMMUNIST PARTY FUNCTIONARIES

Do you feel Radio Liberty broadcasts also reach Communist Party functionaries in the Soviet Union and what effect do you suppose it has on them?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I have talked to some of them myself and I have talked to many of our officers who have much more experience than I have and I find they like the information that comes not only from abroad but from within their own country, but they don't get it in any other way and it helps them. Some of them who are attached to government don't like some of the criticisms that are critical analyses of some of the action because they may be involved in them, but the nongovernmental officials are delighted to have the analyses as well as the information itself, and it is really a function which I think would be a great mistake to abandon. It is quite different from the Voice of America, they have to have very careful researching of what is said in the local press and analyzing how closely it comes to the reality of what has been admitted and then to carry on their broadcasts and on their news services the things which haven't been said and that is why it costs as much as it does and that is why Voice of America is not

qualified to carry it on and I would not like to see Voice of America get into this kind of operation, it should be kept apart and try to build its reputation as the BBC has and I agree with Justice Goldberg when he said the BBC has a reputation even superior to the Voice of America for the truth, but this itself isn't that. These two radios don't carry the truth but the Voice of America is to carry American information, that is the purpose all over the world, it shouldn't become involved in this particular manner of carrying information to the suppressed people of these countries.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Chairman, we have a 12:30 luncheon with the Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. We vote at 12:30 also.

Senator PERCY. So I would like to just ask the question of the Cambodian bombing of Ambassador Harriman because we will be hearing the Secretary's side of it shortly and we would be pleased to have the benefit of Mr. Harriman's judgment.

BOMBING IN CAMBODIA

Mr. HARRIMAN. I will make it very brief. I heartily endorse the attitude that you and the other Senators have taken. We have no business to continue bombing in Cambodia. It is inhumane and in many cases when you bomb civilians you kill women and children, which we have no moral right to do. To Cambodia we have no obligation and no business to be in it. The situation should be left locally, and incidentally Prince Sihanouk was neutral and if the people want to bring him back it would not be to the disadvantage of the United States.

Senator PERCY. As a negotiator, do you see any advantage to setting a future date, say, August 15, for ending the bombing?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I would see no advantage in setting a future date. The date should be today. It should stop today.

Senator PERCY. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador. We appreciate your opinion.

ACCURACY OF INFORMATION GIVEN TO RUSSIANS, AMERICANS BY U.S. GOVERNMENT

The CHAIRMAN. I have one short question, Mr. Ambassador. I asked you about this and you said you covered it. Do you believe that the information broadcast to the people of Russia by our Government is as accurate as the information our Government gives to the American people?

Mr. HARRIMAN. I wouldn't know, sir; I haven't covered it today. I know during the war I listened to BBC because I found it more accurate than the Voice of America. It was in Moscow certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. I mean are the programs which we conduct, that is Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe and VOA, are they as accurate to the people of Russia as they are to the American people? I refer to the kind of information our Government has been giving the American people the last 10 years.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Well, it should be objective to make the information broadcast as accurate as possible and I would hope that the guide-

lines that have been spelled out would be followed and I would hope the Board when it comes into existence will see they are carried out.

To answer your question I would have to audit all of the broadcasts and I have never had an opportunity to do it. I was only invited by you to come here yesterday and I have not spent months preparing myself. I am basing my judgments on the broad experience I have had and the great importance to do everything we can to get accurate information and understanding of it to the people of Russia and Eastern Europe. The security of the world depends on us and I really hope that you will change your views on this and I think with great study I have great respect for your judgment.

The CHAIRMAN. I will do my best to try to understand it, Governor.

Mr. HARRIMAN. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

The next witness is the Honorable George Ball, former Under Secretary of State and now I believe a partner in a very distinguished banking house.

STATEMENT OF HON. GEORGE BALL, FORMER UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. BALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I apologize to the committee for not having a prepared statement but I only returned from overseas last night and airplanes are not very conducive to literary efforts, so I didn't put anything down on paper for submission. I do have a brief observation I would like to make.

VIEWS REPRESENTED BEFORE COMMITTEE

I had the opportunity to listen to the testimony of the other witnesses this morning. I would hope I may say parenthetically that the testimony before the committee this morning is not regarded or represented in the media as confrontation between old cold war years on the one hand and Mr. Goldberg representing the new dispensation on the other. I don't think there is any fundamental difference in our analysis of the situation or in our general views.

Mr. Justice Goldberg said that he could differentiate between a change in the weather and a change in the climate and I think that is exactly the view which we take. Certainly the extreme views on either side have not been represented before this committee this morning, that on the one hand there has been none of the representatives who have taken the position that the cold war was simply an invention of the West and that the West has largely itself to blame for the difficulties we have had ever since the war. This was the attitude of the revisionist historians which is a very prevalent one in some quarters, but I am sure that Justice Goldberg doesn't hold that view and I know that Ambassador Harriman and I do not.

As far as the other extreme, nothing has changed since Stalin, that seems to be equally wrong. Obviously, there have been very great changes. There has been evolution of the situation in the Soviet Union that makes it possible for us to have that kind of communication back and forth which we haven't been able to have since the war. I regard this as very desirable to encourage it in any way and that is one of the reasons why I find myself here in support of the proposal for the

continuation and funding of the activities of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

There are, I think, very good reasons why we ought to take a careful look at why this change has taken place in the Soviet Union. Kremlinology even in its sophisticated form today is not a precise science, as we all know, so I think it is impossible to say what goes on with any very great accuracy behind the forbidding walls of the Kremlin. Nevertheless, there are considerations which seem to me to have inspired the Chairman Brezhnev trip and the attitude he took on that trip and progress that has been made in the last 2 or 3 years particularly in moving toward some solid agreements on limited areas of common interest.

One of the motivations obviously is the problem the Soviet Union faces with its long border with China and the other is simply the fact its economic system doesn't work very well. It is the nature of the thing I suspect that it never can work very well. With its market mechanism, I think they are going to have great difficulty ever achieving a level of efficiency comparable to that of Western nations. Beyond that there is the fact that the Soviet Union seems to feel the need to be responsive to the growing expectations of the people for material goods and indeed to the Soviet public opinion about which a good deal has been said here this morning.

ELITE IN SOVIET UNION

I think again that if we look behind the question of public opinion, perhaps the most important element or the most important two elements are what Ambassador Harriman referred to, the increased literacy of the Soviet people on the one hand, but also the development within the Soviet Union of a very brave and very effective elite, a handful of people. "Handful" is probably too narrow a word to use. A group of people in the various arts but primarily perhaps in literature, in politics, who have kept a name alive and who have done it at very great risk to themselves. For one of the sad aspects of the present situation is that as the Soviet Union has begun to turn a more benign appearing face toward the West, it has at the same time become increasingly repressive as far as expression of free views goes within the Soviet Union itself. I think it is of the very greatest importance that we encourage this elite because I think that the elite and the efforts that are being made has been responsible for a good deal of the improvement in the attitude of the Soviet Union toward the West with the recognition of the need to work toward immediate relations with the United States and other Western nations. The activities of the elite in the Soviet Union are extraordinarily brave and extraordinarily effective. Since they are deprived to a very considerable extent of the normal access to the normal media of communication they have developed techniques of very high order which are, I think, admirably in the council in which they have been carried out. Among these other techniques is what is called "samizdat." "Samizdat" is self-publishing in Russian. What it amounts to is the typing of type scripts of books, of articles, of political commentary, of every kind of description, including poetry, in which all of the literary arts are represented. Samizdat is circulated by hand within the Soviet Union. That makes available to the authors, however, only a limited circulation in the nature of things.

FUNCTION OF RADIO LIBERTY: CIRCULATION OF SAMIZDAT MATERIAL

I would say that perhaps the most important function that Radio Liberty perhaps has performed is to serve as a kind of ancillary to this effort to assure the circulation or the availability to a very much wider audience of this samizdat material because the Radio Liberty station has the greatest collection of samizdat in the world, 2,000 or 3,000 different pages of it. And it gives currency to this within the Soviet Union by beaming it back. The result is that there is a kind of multiplier factor. What could be achieved through circulation from person to person of type scripts is multiplied enormously by the availability of this samizdat material through the activities of Radio Liberty. And it is this kind of thing which seems to me to be very well worth preserving, in fact, very important that we preserve it, this kind of activity.

In providing to the Soviet people not only the benefit of what their artists and their writers and their literary people have produced, which keeps alive a sense of liberty, a feeling that they are having access to new thinking, to new literary expressions, but that also gives them a knowledge of what is going on in the neighborhood, in the area, in the country, because the fundamental purpose that the Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe each play is a purpose of being a kind of surrogate local radio. In other words, it keeps the people apprised of what is happening when they are denied those facts by the very repressive censorship that exists within the Soviet Union and in most of the Eastern European countries themselves.

I can't think of anything that encourages them to persevere in what is necessarily an admirably heroic effort to keep this flame alive than this. This is what was meant by the quotation of Solzhenitsyn which appears in the beginning of the publication by the Eisenhower Commission, in which he said that this is the way we find out, this is, in other words, indicating as far as he was concerned, and his fellow intellectuals, that it was on Radio Liberty that they had to rely primarily for information as to what was going on and, therefore, the basic facts and the basic ideas which they could incorporate themselves in their own writings.

So I would say that given the very plaintive cries that we have heard from the Soviet Union, not only Solzhenitsyn but also from other intellectuals as well, we would be doing them a very cruel disservice if the service of these stations were to be discontinued. Beyond that, we would be removing from the total spectrum of possibilities one of the most effective instruments for bringing about benign change within the Soviet Union. When I say "benign change," obviously these stations are not advocating change in the Communist system, they are not attacking frontally the assumptions of the Soviet Union leadership; what they are doing is providing information, what they are doing is providing for the free circulation of ideas. They are opening the windows, letting some free air blow through.

VOA COULD NOT PROVIDE RL'S FUNCTION

This is a service which could not in the nature of things be provided by the Voice of America which is primarily concerned with telling about what is happening in the outside world and interpreting

American foreign policy to the people of these countries. It is quite a different function and I think that we have got a going thing and I think it would be unfortunate to change it. We have something that has built up a credibility, it has built up a listenership; I think the Soviet peoples who rely on these stations would be very dismayed if there was to be a change in it, no longer was there a Radio Free Europe or Radio Liberty, this was again a part of the Voice of America which doesn't in the nature of things have quite the same credence.

You may say, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is a somewhat artificial difference in that if the U.S. Government funds both services that, therefore, one should be given no more credence than the other, but in fact I think they are. I think for historical reasons they are, for the fact that there is to be a different structure here as proposed, that this board is to be a board which doesn't merely represent the executive branch where the members are going to be subject to confirmation by the Congress.

REPRESENTATION OF UNITED STATES TO AMERICAN PEOPLE

I wholly agree with the concern that you have expressed, Mr. Chairman, about the fact that this representation of the United States to the American people and the information provided has certainly not been forthright and certainly in many cases been distorted and downright dishonest.

The CHAIRMAN. You say they do give the truth to foreign people but they lie to the American people. Is that what you say? Why do they lie, if that is so?

Mr. BALL. I am not talking of the Voice of America, I am not defending it, I am not criticizing, I am not speaking about it. What I was suggesting was that these stations which have over a period of time developed a reputation for accuracy primarily in representing the facts going on within the countries themselves, they are the local service station, that they have developed a reputation for credibility which is a very valuable American asset and that in the structure which is proposed for the conduct of these stations in the future there will be a board, the board will be subject to confirmation by Congress, and I think the interposition of this board as kind of as a board of scrutiny can be extremely effective.

TREATMENT OF WATERGATE BY RFE AND RL

The question was raised as to what extent Watergate had been treated by the Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty. I am assured that there has been no inhibitions on the representations of the facts as they have been coming out of Washington, none of the restraints placed on those two stations such as I understand from the papers have been placed on the Voice of America, and they have tried to present very fully and freely and frankly what the situation is as it emerges and at the same time to point out the situation within the American constitutional structure of the division of powers, and to point out the indispensable value of a free press, which is one of the things that made the most emphatic shock to the people of these beleaguered countries or at least these countries that are subject to the kind of internal repression, that

a free press in America is resulting in the resolution of problems which otherwise wouldn't have come to the light of day and is, therefore, serving a most vital purpose, which is entirely an inspiration to them.

EVIDENCE OF RADIOS' REPUTATION FOR FACTUAL REPORTING QUESTIONS

The CHAIRMAN. This is not the free press, it won't be the free press running Radio Liberty; you can't equate Radio Liberty to the free press.

Mr. BALL. I am not suggesting that. What I am suggesting is in the broadcast of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe they have emphasized the importance of the free press in bringing out these disclosures and, therefore, its great value that it is performing to the American people, the implication being that the free press within these countries would serve the same purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. In the same way that the Vice President emphasized the importance of free press here.

Mr. BALL. No, I wouldn't suggest—

The CHAIRMAN. You can't disassociate. With all this is still a government operation. When it was a CIA government operation it was still a government operation. This great reputation you are saying was built up, the CIA reputation for this kind of factual reporting—I don't know any other evidence of it then, just your statement.

Mr. BALL. As I understand, you have had an audit, the committee has had an audit by the Library of Congress. They reported this is factual reporting.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that what you are relying on, not your own information?

Mr. BALL. I don't have available to me information on my own other than the reports of the Commission and the indications of what has been turned up by the audit of the Library of Congress and the testimony of the Soviet citizens themselves, particularly the Soviets intellectual leaders.

PURPOSE OF RADIO LIBERTY, OTHER RADIOS

The CHAIRMAN. We have already had evidence from several witnesses that BBC has a better reputation for the accuracy over the years than our own operations. You seem to give all of this credit to Radio Liberty, but there are half a dozen other operations from Western European countries. You ignore them. What is the unique quality of Radio Liberty and BBC and German and French and Italian and Israel that the other radios don't have?

Mr. BALL. The quality relates to the unique purpose. The BBC, the others, the broadcasts of the other Western European governments is not directed toward the same purpose as Radio Liberty.

The CHAIRMAN. What is that purpose?

Mr. BALL. Their purpose is to do very much what Voice of America does for the United States, to interpret what is happening in their countries and to interpret their own nation's foreign policies. But the point is, Mr. Chairman, that what Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe seem to do is to tell the people in the countries what is happening in their own countries to give them the information which their repressive censorship within those countries denies them so they can be

familiar with what is happening in their own countries, what their own people are writing, what their own people are thinking, through these extraordinary documents of Samizdat. This is unique. This has nothing to do with BBC, it has nothing to do with the other.

The CHAIRMAN. If that is so valuable why can't Voice of America do it?

WHY CHANGE TO VOICE OF AMERICA?

Mr. BALL. Because let me ask the question, if I may, and I also hesitate to reverse the process and ask a question of the committee. If I may ask a question, it is simply this, why make the change? We have something that is establishing credibility.

The CHAIRMAN. \$50 million is the main reason; \$56 million, for Voice of America. I would be perfectly willing to add all or part of it to the Voice of America if that is the operation. It certainly would get it under some control. As it is, it is a remote operation, as you know, about 90 percent or from these countries whose main objective is to return to the old form of government.

Mr. BALL. I would suggest, sir, that the structure that is proposed is much more likely to get it under control than turn over to the Voice of America. One of the points discussed is the fact Voice of America has been placed under some restriction in its broadcast of the Watergate. That is simply because the Voice of America is an arm of the administration.

OPERATION OF RADIO LIBERTY

The CHAIRMAN. What is the Radio Liberty now, how is it operated presently, today?

Mr. BALL. It is operating simply——

The CHAIRMAN. Not an arm of the Government?

Mr. BALL. It's more or less been let alone.

FREEDOM OF RADIOS FROM INFLUENCES

Addressing myself to the legislation which is before the committee, the kind of structure which is being proposed here as a result of Milton Eisenhower's committee study, is to have a board which the Congress will have to confirm and on which the Congress could make certain for itself is going to be free from influences of this kind. Actually, with far greater assurance than it has with regard to Voice of America.

The CHAIRMAN. If they are honest in presenting it to the Congress and if we have nothing to do with it, it will not serve our Government's purposes.

Mr. BALL. There is a very great difference, Mr. Chairman, between saying that we are not going to serve the purposes of the Government and saying what we are going to do is to serve America's longer range interests by trying to inform these people as to what is going on in their own countries, making clear that we are not going to do things that are in derogation or violation of the foreign policy of the United States.

DOUBLE STANDARD ON TRUTH

The CHAIRMAN. Coming from government that has been doing what it has been doing in the last 10 years—I go back to the previous ad-

ministration and the kind of information given by that government to the American people—I don't know how you have all of this confidence in the double standard. This is about the first time I thought of it in this way. Our Government has deliberately misinformed the U.S. people while at the same time we are very scrupulous about telling the truth to foreigners. This is very strange theory.

Senator JAVITS. If I may interject a remark, it is not an unusual theory. In human life many people testify to numerous things which are perfectly true and occasionally lie about something else. The witness is trying to screen it out.

The CHAIRMAN. So you agree that we tell the truth to foreigners and misrepresent the truth to our own people, the Government itself?

Senator JAVITS. Mr. Ball is the witness. I will speak for myself in due course.

The CHAIRMAN. You interrupted. I thought perhaps that was the purport.

Senator JAVITS. I think we will take adequate precautions on this bill, Mr. Chairman, to see that lying or the opportunity for lying is minimized and that the money is used for the purpose for which the bill intended and to which the witness is testifying.

The CHAIRMAN. The money that is presently being used is under the direction of the Secretary of State. It has been that way and we have gotten this great reputation we are told for truthfulness by the Under Secretary of State. My impression is as much part of the Government as anybody else.

Mr. BALL. If I may make one observation and that is I think that the Congress of the United States has a much greater opportunity for controlling these situations than it has exercised in the past, and if you will look at the present disclosures coming out, of the most unattractive kind through the hearings and so on for the last few days, I think one observation became very real and clear, these people weren't subject to congressional confirmation, by and large the people who besmirched the image of the United States. They were people who were simply servants of the White House, but they were not available to the Congress because they were within the kind of encircling arms of the White House nor were they confirmed by the Congress. What we are proposing here is a board which would be subject, members would be subject to confirmation and from whom it seems to me that the Congress if it chooses can exact the most complete assurances with regard to the kind of objectivities they will exercise.

DISASSOCIATION FROM GOVERNMENT POLICE

The CHAIRMAN. But really when it comes down to it, I don't want to argue too much. I want the others to take the time. If we accept your thesis this is completely disassociated from the current policies of the Government, then I am bound to ask why then use public funds for it. I think as Arthur Goldberg said, it is all right for private. If AP and UP or CBS or someone wants to do it, I have no objection. I object to paying \$50 million for this kind of operation. It is a lot of money. On top of all of the other that we pay for that kind of a program. If it isn't directed for the usual Government information program, then I don't think we should pay \$50 million for it. These are tax moneys.

Mr. BAILL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. You were saying "disassociated." I don't think the Congress will disassociate. I have had great difficulty in maintaining some degree of integrity of the exchange program because there is a tendency always to use them. Every now and then we will find the CIA intervening in that and soliciting one of those people to be its agent. You know about that type of thing. It is a great problem. I don't see how you can expect it to be independent of the Government and put to the Congress that this has nothing to do with our Government propaganda. It is always going to be just information. Why do that, why spend \$50 million for it? They can get the same facts from other areas if they are interested in it.

DOMESTIC PROPAGANDA IN RUSSIA

One last thing. The recent report is that all of the domestic propaganda, if you like, in Russia has been extremely favorable, more favorable, I suppose, to America than it has ever been in its history.

Mr. BAILL. It has been very limited but Mr. Brezhnev in particular I think has seen it to his interests and to the interests of the policies in the Kremlin right now to create a favorable impression. It can be turned off tomorrow. The point is that this is what we are doing, is to say to these people from now on any information that you get is going to be entirely subject to the whim of your governments which can be a very transient whim. Let me correct the record in one respect. I am not suggesting at all that what these radios will be doing will be independent of the U.S. Government. I am suggesting that a structure has been set up here to assure that this will be factual reporting, factual reporting of the kind that these radios are supposed to be doing, is to my mind very much in the interest of the U.S. Government because it can lead to the encouragement of the kind of benign change within these countries which is exactly what we are going to have to hope for if we are ever going to have a really stable situation in the West.

QUESTION AT ISSUE ASSUMED

The CHAIRMAN. I don't wish to take up any more time, but I think it's very dubious it will do that. You assume the very question at issue; you assume this independence. If I can accept that, then the question comes, Why is the United States worth \$50 million in financing? I don't wish to say anymore. I think in the limited time I would like to yield to Senator Aiken.

CONTRIBUTION OF U.S. CORPORATIONS TO RADIO FUND

Senator AIKEN. I only have one question. As you heard when Ambassador Goldberg was testifying, I referred to the fact that previously the American corporations had contributed \$2 million to the radio fund. Do you think that they would be willing to contribute comparable amounts this year providing that Congress appropriated a comparable amount?

Mr. BAILL. Well, I think if Congress appropriated a comparable amount of \$2 million there wouldn't be any radios.

Senator AIKEN. Suppose Congress appropriated 20 percent more and the corporations appropriated \$2,400,000, do you think they would be willing to do that?

Mr. BALL. I think some contributions, some private contribution is possible. I don't think in the magnitude to make this operative it is possible. I agree with your comments, I see no reason why names of these companies shouldn't be made public. I think they are being asked now if it is agreeable to them.

Senator AIKEN. I would expect they would have gotten a 2-page spread in the New York Times to publicize their contributions if they were the contributors. I am not asking if you know who any of them are. I did wonder whether or not they make annual reports to their stockholders and I assume they are mostly companies that have stockholders.

Mr. BALL. They make annual reports to stockholders. I think if you look at most stockholders reports in the area of contributions they usually have some figure.

Senator AIKEN. They would probably be buried.

Mr. BALL. These contributions from any one company would not be of sufficient magnitude.

Senator AIKEN. If they didn't bury the figures, they would probably get a lot of mail, I think. I haven't taken a firm position on this, but I do want to call attention to the fact that a year ago I supported the radios, both in their continuing resolution and the year's extension of time. At that time we did lay down some conditions upon which continuation of the program could be contingent, and I think they were pretty good. I am not going to take up any more time because Senator Percy, author of the bill, is entitled to the last 5 minutes, and then we have to get out of here and go vote.

COMPLIMENT TO WITNESS

Senator PERCY. Secretary Ball, I think it is a great compliment to you that Ambassador Harriman stayed to hear your testimony. Seldom does any witness stay. They generally flee from the room as soon as they finish.

Mr. BALL. If he wasn't a very great friend of mine I suspect he was merely making sure I didn't say anything that undercut what he said.

Senator PERCY. I am sure you had no fear in that regard.

CAMBODIAN PROBLEM

I would like first to ask if you could help us on the Cambodian problem.

Mr. BALL. Yes, sir.

Senator PERCY. I think your comments would be extremely valuable to us. None of us want this confrontation. We have wanted to avoid it, yet here we have it and your vantage point would be extremely important.

Mr. BALL. Senator Percy, I think that the effort of the administration to prolong, to continue to maintain some moneys for use in continued bombing of Cambodia is quite outrageous. I see no point

in it. I think that the bombing of Cambodia is totally without any support in the law whatever. It isn't a situation where there are American troops longer in the country. There simply are none. That justification, which was a dubious one at best, which was heard a year or so ago, no longer has validity, no longer has relevance. Nor do I think that the United States should undertake unilaterally cease-fire. This was not contemplated in the arrangements that have been worked out and I, therefore, would hope that the Congress will persevere and the Senate will persevere in the action it has taken, because I think this should be brought to a stop.

As to whether it would affect the negotiations, this seems to me to be very artificial because it is perfectly evident to the adversaries that this bombing authority is at best tenuous and at most limited in duration and whether it is going to be cut off August 15 or September 1 or whenever, the effect of the negotiation is exactly the same.

I agree entirely with what Ambassador Harriman said, I think it should be stopped today. I think it should have been stopped before.

Senator PERCY. Can you offer any basis for Mr. Laird saying yesterday there could be compromise, perhaps August 15? Is there any real objective to be served by this? Is there any basis for compromise?

Mr. BALL. I frankly see no basis for compromise.

Senator PERCY. What about the people who are going to be killed in the meantime? The leverage we have ought to be enough for North Vietnam to realize that if they want any kind of economic cooperation they had better adhere to the agreements they have signed. We are not going to back down on that, and it is not in their interest to break the agreements.

Mr. BALL. As to how they will resolve that question I can't say because what weight they really put on economic assistance I think remains to be seen. I have some skepticism on the subject myself. I do not think that the United States should undertake or indeed has undertaken a unilateral policing of the cease-fire and I think if we put ourselves in that position then we haven't changed anything. We have our soldiers out but we are still fighting a war and this seems to me to be a very mistaken position for the United States to be in.

Senator PERCY. A final comment. It seems to me we have hardly left the South Vietnamese helpless. They have a huge army. If they require air support, they have 40,000 trained people in their air force with 2,000 American bombers and fighters totally under their control, and I presume enough ammunition to last them for a long time to come.

EFFECT OF CONTINUED BROADCASTING ON DÉTENTE

On Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, why do you think continued broadcasting by these radios helps rather than hinders détente?

Mr. BALL. Well, for the reasons that I suggested, I think that the support of the very courageous position that is being taken by the intellectual elite in these countries in their efforts to push, create a public opinion that presses toward a more benign attitude on their governments is the only way, lying at the end of the road where progress is really going to be made and if we can support that effort then it seems to me this is money very well spent, very well continued.

HOW LONG WILL NEED FOR RADIO CONTINUE?

Senator PERCY. How long do you foresee a continuing need to assure a free flow of information into the Soviet Union and East Europe by such means as these radios?

Mr. BALL. You know, I hear very often the suggestion and I think Ambassador Goldberg made it this morning, now it is 28 years after the war, and implication being activities of this kind are unnatural. What that assumes, it seems to me, is a kind of inarticulate premise that this is a natural world we live in. It is certainly an unnatural world when there is still an Iron Curtain, when there is still a wall in Berlin, where there is still a kind of repressive censorship that exists in these countries. I would say that these activities ought to continue so long as that kind of censorship continues and the effort to get the doors and windows open because this seems to me to be the only hope of really stable and lasting peace.

QUESTION OF EUROPEAN CONTRIBUTIONS

Senator PERCY. I agreed with the chairman last year, and so advised the State Department, that I felt every effort should be made to persuade Western European countries interested in détente to assist in the financing of these stations and help reduce the balance-of-payments costs to us. What is the problem in your judgment, since the Commission has said that large contributions cannot be expected?

Mr. BALL. There are two, there are several problems here, it seems to me. First, there is the question as to whether European governments should contribute, and second, whether there should be contributions from European private sources. As to the contribution of European governments, I think Mr. Eisenhower's commission found that it probably wouldn't be feasible to have them contribute to the actual operation of the stations but that they might contribute to their research efforts and that this would be quite proper.

As to the question of—let me say as to that, that the attitude of European governments generally is one of some confusion and reserve at the present time with regard to any of these East-West problems. I have just come back from Europe, I go there very often, I was there yesterday morning actually.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you excuse me. They are calling a vote; I have to go. There are two votes. You continue until you have to go.

Senator PERCY. Thank you.

Mr. BALL. They see the spectacle of great summit meetings in which the President goes to Moscow or Chairman Brezhnev comes to Washington. They have a feeling that the solution of East-West problems are to a considerable extent being taken out of their hands. Therefore, this contributes to a feeling that they have had, really this has almost become a United States-Soviet matter. They are unhappy about it. They are worried about it because they are afraid this—they refer to them as Yalta-type agreements. I know I agree with Ambassador Harriman's views, Yalta did not represent what they say it represented. But anyway they see this as a situation in which the great super powers are to an extent dividing up the world. We are recognizing the Eastern European empire of the Soviet Union as kind of a sphere of influence which we won't bother with and on the western side

that we are acting without very much consultation with the Western European Allies.

In that kind of a climate it is very difficult to get the governments to think in terms of making contributions to something which the United States has been operating for a long time.

As far as private contributions from Europeans are concerned, one of the problems we face here is that there is no tradition of this kind of thing, there is no tradition in the original institutional way as there is in the United States to anything like the same extent and corporations themselves regard it as a whole extent and corporations themselves regard it as a whole new idea to suggest to them that they might make a public service contribution. I hope this is changing. I think there is some evidence it is. But it is going to take a long time and we have to deal with reality as we find them now.

RADIOS CONTRIBUTE TO CLIMATE OF RELAXATION BETWEEN
UNITED STATES AND U.S.S.R.

Senator PERCY. Would you support the statement that the radios have actually contributed indirectly to creating a climate of greater relaxation between our own country and the Soviet Union?

Mr. BALL. I think they have. I think they have because they have primarily—because they have kept the peoples informed as to what was happening within their own countries and given them even a greater desire to gain access to the ideas of the West as they have heard them. It's increased their expectations by their knowledge of what is happening in the West, but beyond this it sustained and encouraged a brilliant and very hard-pressed intellectual elite in these countries who really kept the flame alive.

REF, RL AS ALLIED ENTERPRISE

Senator PERCY. You have always been a strong proponent of close cooperation between the United States and Western Europe. Could you visualize Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty being turned into an allied enterprise?

Mr. BALL. Not for some time to come, partly because of the manner in which we are conducting our own diplomacy. To the extent that we continue to deal on a super power to super power basis, and there is some argument for our continuing to do so, and the Western European governments feel somewhat left out, I think it would be very hard to expect them to join in this effort.

Now to the extent that that may change, and I would see that there are real reasons that it might change with the more open government which we may expect as part of the result of the agonies we are presently going through, then I think in a climate where there is a feeling that we are moving in full cooperation and consultation with our allies, that this might be a part of the agenda.

REF, RL OF HIGH PRIORITY TO WITNESS

Senator PERCY. With the infinite variety of interests to which you can devote yourself and the tremendous demands on your time, how do you happen to pick Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty for such

high priority in your schedule? I wish I had asked the same question of Ambassador Harrimon, but I think I know his answer.

Mr. BALL. I feel it is very important from the point of view of the interests of the United States. I feel also that we would be doing a great disservice to our own traditions if we didn't give full support to the efforts of the intellectual elite, the group in these countries who were fighting for greater freedom and greater liberty and bringing pressures on their governments to bring these things about.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Secretary, we thank you very much for being here and we are most grateful for your testimony.

These hearings will be adjourned until 2 p.m. when our first witness will be Mr. Paul Bartlett.

[Whereupon, at 12:40 p.m., the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 2 p.m. of the same day.]

AFTERNOON SESSION

[The committee reconvened at 2:20 p.m., Senator Charles H. Percy presiding.]

Senator PERCY. We will resume our hearings. I regret that we have been delayed, not only by the committee's luncheon with the Secretary of State, but also because of a record vote on the floor.

We are delighted to have as our first witness Mr. Paul Bartlett.

STATEMENT OF PAUL R. BARTLETT, INDEPENDENT COMMUNICATIONS CONSULTANT

Senator PERCY. Mr. Bartlett, you have submitted some very interesting testimony. If you would care to summarize it, the entire testimony will be placed into the record. We will have some questions for you. However, you may proceed as you wish.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank the committee, too, for the opportunity to appear before you today when you are discussing the future of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

May I say especially, and parenthetically, that I think it is very significant that the senior legislative House offers as many opportunities as it does to people who are private citizens with some expertise in their field, but who are not necessarily distinguished elder statesmen.

I was quite touched this morning with your comment about your willingness and interest in hearing an independent point of view from someone not otherwise connected with the matter.

With your permission, I think the best thing for me to do is to proceed with my statement. It was prepared after 4 or 5 years of rather continuous study and trips abroad, and as a result of lifelong experience in broadcasting.

When I determined that I had traveled 5,000 miles as a public citizen, I think I would like to proceed with my statement and then answer any questions that you have.

First, I would like to make it clear that I do not appear here today in behalf of any public or private corporation, association, or other entity, but as a private citizen who has been both a student and practitioner of international broadcasting, and as one who has become

increasingly concerned and deeply distressed over the direction, philosophy and effectiveness of the vast international broadcasting effort which is currently paid for by the American taxpayer.

RFE, RL SHOULD BE CLOSED OR REORIENTED

It has long been my view that RFE and Liberty, in their present form, should be closed down and their facilities put to better use, or in the alternative—and I might add a better alternative—that they should be so changed and reoriented as to become in the end completely new and different stations. Their operations are inconsistent with our national heritage, and out of step with today's national goals.

Later in my statement I shall present a specific plan for a drastic reorganization of RFE and Liberty which could make them serve the national interest better and at greatly reduced cost; which would combine them with some other U.S. overseas broadcasting services also badly in need of revitalizing; and which could, in my opinion, cure some of the defects which seem inherent in the proposed legislation.

REPORT OF PRESIDENTIAL STUDY COMMISSION

But first I want to comment on some of the misconceptions which continue to surround RFE and Radio Liberty, and on the "Report of the Presidential Study Commission on International Broadcasting" which was released last month and is the basis for the legislation which has been sent to the Congress.

The report is an outright endorsement of the tired old status quo, except for rather meaningless changes in providing financial support to the stations. It contemplates their continued existence, substantially unchanged, for an extended period of years, or in fact until the governments of two-thirds of the world's people have had a change of heart regarding the "right to know." In essence the report approves the perpetuation and even the extension of the deception about the so-called "private and independent" nature of RFE and Liberty. It recommends capital improvements which are undoubtedly dear to the heart of the staff, but which are in my view unnecessary.

The report, and the legislation it has fathered, envisages spending more than half a billion dollars over the next decade to keep RFE and Liberty alive and happy. This is far too many dollars for far too little good.

ROLE OF RADIOS

Much as I abhor the suppression of information throughout areas of Soviet hegemony, I remain unconvinced that it is the obligation of the American taxpayer to make sure every Russian, Pole, or Hungarian knows everything his public officials are doing, or everything that happens in his country.

As one who has spent nearly 30 years in broadcast communications of all types I strongly believe in an exchange of information among the peoples of the world. But exchanging information among nations is not the role of RFE and Liberty. That job is done by BBC, Voice of America, and many other international broadcasters. The special and primary mission of RFE and Liberty is to give people in the eastern

zones domestic information not available to them locally, and even this mission may well be accomplished better by other broadcasters. Worse yet, these stations say what the State Department wants said by some entity it can then officially disavow.

EFFECTIVENESS OF RFE, RL

What about the effectiveness of RFE and Liberty? Obviously every exile, refugee or dissident is gleeful over any scrap of news which seems to embarrass the regime he detests. Naturally every writer, unpublished at home, and every underground editor likes to hear his work read over a powerful distant station. Naturally every American whose national homeland is enslaved cheers anyone who wishes it to be free. There are hundreds of letters and statements to prove it.

Mr. Chairman, I thoroughly agree. I cheer for them, too.

Still, the fact is that aside from Sino-Soviet countermeasures, most of the world's jamming is directed at RFE and Liberty and I have seen no hard evidence to convince me that the Soviet or other east bloc masses are reached. Certainly not in numbers which justify the present costs.

RFE, RL CONSTITUTE DECEPTIONS OF U.S. PEOPLE

But quite apart from considerations of cost, RFE and Radio Liberty are both, by their very nature, offensive to the American heritage and ideal. Both constitute monstrous deceptions of the American people—deceptions perpetrated by our own Government no doubt in the interest of national security.

Nor is this mass deception at an end. It may even be extended and compounded. The Presidential report suggests that the President head a capital fund drive for these so-called "private" stations. It speaks repeatedly of their "independent" staff people, the danger of "losing their nonofficial status" and of the problem of how "private corporations could transfer assets to a government agency."

Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were conceived in the State Department, born to the CIA, and fed from the public treasury. All the funds they have received which did not come directly from the taxpayers, as most of them did, were obtained from corporations whose officers knew they were contributing to "front" operations, or from schoolchildren and other members of the public who were unknowing victims of the deception.

I believe the time has come for this committee and the Congress to strip RFE and Liberty of their false facades once and for all. If the stations are to continue, the fake cover corporations, funds and committees should be junked. They should become legally what they are in fact—corporations in which the U.S. Government owns all the stock. The charades should end! They should be nationalized, in other words.

PROPOSED BILL

Unfortunately, the proposed bill does little more than provide a new way for money to go from the Treasury to the stations. It does not require all the economies which would come from consolidating the operations. The same old phony "private" concept would continue. Oper-

ating budgets would be increased. Since I believe that RFE and Liberty have been doing is basically wrong. I see little merit in finding a more expensive way to do more of the same.

What the stations need is not a new committee. It is change. Change in mission, change in method, change in organization, change in name.

STATIONS COULD BE COMBINED, REORIENTED

In my professional opinion both the stations could be combined and reoriented in a manner which would permit their excellent facilities to be used twice as effectively in the true international exchange of ideas and information at something like half their present cost.

If the stations were also combined with some other overseas Government broadcasting facilities which are now misused or dying on the vine other benefits of immense importance could be derived.

ALTERNATIVE TO PENDING LEGISLATION SUGGESTED

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to respectfully suggest an alternative to the legislation before you. A proposal which could serve as an omnibus to completely reorganize RFE and Liberty and at the same time solve some other nagging international broadcasting problems which have concerned the committee.

May I add parenthetically here, I was quite taken by Senator Humphrey's remark this morning when he said we really have better propaganda than anybody else via our commercialization.

Here is what I propose:

1. That a corporation to be called "The International Broadcasting Corporation" be chartered by the Congress for the purpose of operating international broadcasting stations located outside the continental United States.

2. That the corporation be granted initial capital of \$100 million, plus all the assets used and useful, including licenses and agreements of the following Government-sponsored overseas broadcasting operations:

- (a) All the assets of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

- (b) All the assets and control of RIAS in Berlin.

- (c) All the assets of the million watt long wave transmitter now being operated by the Voice of America at Munich on the Radio Moscow frequency.

- (d) All the assets of some other selected Government-owned operations overseas with commercial potential.

3. That the corporation be directed and authorized to engage in commercial radio and TV broadcasting wherever it can overseas.

4. That the corporation be authorized to participate in joint ventures with other private or governmental entities.

5. That the corporation be authorized to lease its assets to private or Government users on reasonable terms, or to dispose of unwanted facilities.

6. That the corporation be required to continue broadcasting to all the areas now served by RFE and Liberty, but only under a mandate not to engage in provocative broadcasting designed to change any country's social or economic order. More specifically, I suggest that the names "Radio Free Europe" and "Radio Liberty" be dropped,

possibly being replaced by names such as "Europe West" or "Radio West".

7. That the corporation be charged with fostering international goodwill by furthering trade and commercial relations.

8. That the corporation be given "chosen instrument" status and help from all branches of government when seeking licenses or agreements with foreign governments.

9. That the corporation maintain no connection with the CIA, State Department, or Defense Department, and that it be beholden to no Government agency, but that it report by some means to the Congress.

10. That the corporation be eligible for public subsidy from the Congress but not before 2 years after it commences operations, and then only if it can make a satisfactory showing that it is doing everything possible to become self-supporting.

11. That the corporations' directors be appointed jointly by the President and congressional leaders with the requirement that at least half the directors have actual commercial rather than government broadcasting experience.

In my opinion, such a corporation could soon be operating some of the world's most popular broadcasting stations, some of which could be financially profitable—all a credit to America and a boon to the taxpayer. Everyone would also benefit from the reduced jamming which would result.

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN BROADCASTING

In closing I want to comment philosophically on the role of Government in broadcasting. It has always seemed strange to me that a nation which prides itself as much on "freedom of the press" as we do should be as heavily involved in broadcasting as our Government is.

Freedom of the press would seem to mean primarily freedom from control by Government. Today when the term "press" includes broadcasting, I think we might ask ourselves how any stations operating on funds from Government can be free from control by that government.

It is as unlikely that a "kept press" will be a truly "free press" as it is that a harlot will be a virgin. That is why I so strongly urge that RFE and Liberty be replaced by different, more imaginative operations which are more in keeping with our national heritage.

Thank you.

Senator PERCY. Thank you very much, Mr. Bartlett.

PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION'S REPORT

I don't know what can be done, other than to have the Congress order the audits that have been mentioned. I have talked personally with Dr. Eisenhower. He went into the issue with no preconceived ideas and with no instruction other than to take a cold, hard, new look.

The commission that he headed was an excellent commission. I have known Dr. Eisenhower for two decades now and I consider him one of the finest and most brilliant men I have met.

Dr. Eisenhower brought to this study the objectivity of a man of letters, a scholar, a man who has served our country in many different capacities.

I have placed great credence in the report and do not look on it as an endorsement of the tired, old status quo.

COMBINING RADIOS

You suggest that the radios should be combined. This suggestion has been made before and probably has some merit. As you may be aware, the Presidential Commission said that this question should be fully considered by the new Board on International Broadcasting which would be established by the legislation now under consideration by this committee.

While I do not prejudge this question, it is my intention to see that the Board when created, as I believe it will be, gives thorough consideration to that suggestion. The way to advance that suggestion is to go right ahead with the creation of the Board.

PROPRIETY OF PROPOSAL FOR GOVERNMENT FINANCED CORPORATION

Your proposal that Congress charter and subsidize a corporation to engage in commercial radio and TV broadcasting overseas, leasing its facilities to both private and government users, raises some questions of propriety.

Is it proper for a government-financed corporation to allow private broadcasters to use its facilities apparently without guidelines which would assure that the taxpayers' money is used overseas in general accord with U.S. foreign policy?

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to respond to that question, and also respond to the two previous remarks you made, Mr. Chairman.

INTEGRITY OF MEMBERS OF COMMISSION

First let me say that as far as Dr. Eisenhower is concerned, I certainly share your high regard for his integrity and the integrity of the members of the commission. I didn't mean to imply, though I don't feel the slightest bit defensive about it, that they simply rubber-stamped something. Nevertheless, it seems to me there was an excessive input from the RFE and Liberty people into that report.

I feel their expertise is not really as much in the international broadcasting field as in some other aspects of the work in which they have all been distinguished.

COMBINING RADIOS AS DEALT WITH IN COMMISSION REPORT

With respect to combining the stations, I noticed the report said that consideration should be given to combining. But the report also went on to make quite a point of the fact that these stations have highly professional staffs, high morale, and it would be injurious to the moral if they were combined, and that this would be a very important consideration.

In my own view, this is a specious argument because while I don't doubt that the staffs are professional in many ways, they are, nevertheless, staffs motivated primarily, and I believe the record shows this—I doubt that they would deny it—by refugee and expatriate philosophy.

They are not really a free and independent staff that is entitled to high morale because they have to guidance because they have the very firmest kind of guidance and they have it daily, right out of New York and right out of Munich. Anyone who has been in the broadcasting business and has visited those stations or has operated an international broadcasting station, as I have, and has talked to the executives of those stations as I have, knows the fact that there is not all that amount of independence there.

These things can be obtained and it is not a matter of just studying for the future. The only reason they will not be combined is because once you start the money flowing nobody wants to turn it off. That is the big hazard. I think Justice Goldberg touched on that this morning and I touched on it 2 years ago when I said no plumber can stop the faucet once the money starts to flow. That seems to be the case.

GUIDELINES FOR LEASING FACILITIES

As far as propriety is concerned, I see absolutely no reason why the Government should not enter into foreign arrangements or any kind of arrangements to lease some of its facilities to private parties and individuals, provided, of course, that it is within guidelines which are acceptable.

I do not mean day-to-day direction guidelines from the State Department. I mean broader ones. For example, we have arrangements in Comsat which are not subject to State regulations, but which, nevertheless, have a quasi-government and industry approach to things.

I say that, as a matter of fact, wherever we find that Government facilities could be better used by private enterprise within the limits of the national interest, we certainly ought to do it, and there ought not to be any bar against it. The thing that has disturbed me from the beginning when this corporation idea was proposed 2 years ago by the same administration that has brought the Eisenhower report, was that they showed no inclination at all to have this committee, which they then called a corporation, do anything except be a wheelbarrow, whatever it is, or a funnel, to carry the money from one place to another.

GOVERNMENT FINANCING OF COMMERCIAL RADIO, TV

Senator PERCY. Then you do feel it is a proper function of Government to finance commercial radio and TV. Would you permit, for instance, public broadcasting in this country, subsidized substantially by the U.S. Treasury, to also carry commercial broadcasts in, say, competition with the networks?

Mr. BARTLETT. No, I wouldn't. As a matter of fact, they come very close to doing that right now. As you well know, you don't have to watch public television very long until you see Mobil and all of these other companies which don't advertise but which get credits on the screen.

Senator PERCY. They get a credit, but there is a little difference between a 5-second credit with the name of a company, and the intense impact of a television commercial on how to brush your teeth, whatever it may be.

Mr. BARTLETT. Certainly.

No, I don't think the Government should subsidize private broadcasters here at home, and I don't think it should subsidize them overseas. But I think that the Government could do a better job by using private corporations to do some of this work than it does for itself, because it is always left handed.

Take the Voice of America now with the Watergate thing. When I was in Europe, when Mr. Haldeman and Mr. Ehrlichman left I said to myself, "My goodness, the Voice is carrying so much information on this. They are trying to prove that they won't throttle the news down because the present administration is in trouble."

Two or 3 weeks later I hear that now BBC is not going to be allowed to do this. So you see, government is never very evenhanded in these matters.

Senator PERCY. Mr. Bartlett, thank you very much for being with us and giving us the benefit of your judgment.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you very much.

Senator PERCY. Our next witness is Mr. David Halberstam.

STATEMENT OF DAVID HALBERSTAM, AUTHOR

Senator PERCY. Without giving a commercial on Government property using Government facilities, I must observe that these hearings have "The Best and the Brightest" before us. On my last trip to Asia, in December, I tucked under my arm a copy of "The Best and the Brightest" and I had a terrible time going through nine embassies without giving it up. My wife wanted to read it after me. We planned to keep it and I think we left it in Australia, the last post we visited. It was in great demand out there.

I wouldn't say I agreed with all the conclusions. I was wounded, almost, as I read some of your commentary on Secretary McNamara, who I think has never been given full credit for his compassion and decency as a human being. But you had to call it as you saw it. You did it brilliantly.

We are happy to have you with us today. Your statement is refreshingly short. Please read it.

Mr. HALBERSTAM. The next time, by the way, if you will let me know, I will equip you with about 50 books that you may want to take overseas.

MYTH OF RADIO FREE EUROPE

Myths occasionally outstay their validity. For altogether too many serious Americans the myth of Radio Free Europe is a conspiratorial radio station manned by right-wing exiles and aristocrats eager to seize power and be returned to their vast estates. The reality could not be more different.

RFE in its daily incarnation is a thoughtful, responsible nonprovocative station run by professionals who are above all aware that, operating as they do from outside the boundaries of the country, their credibility must be impeccable. They are, and this is a vital test for all journalists, accountable and responsible for what they broadcast, and they know how easy it is to lose a listenership.

To my mind they are, in level of performance, intelligence, and accountability, comparable to NBC, CBS, or The New York Times.

They serve a vast area, and this is crucial where there is no comparable alternative for information.

RFE'S CREDIBILITY

Among sophisticated contemporary East Europeans—people who by no means have the exile mentality—RFE has very considerable credibility. In no way is it part of the real excesses of the Cold War, for its validity comes from only one factor—that it contains the truth: To judge it as part of the Cold War is to find the broadcaster as guilty as the jammer. The idea of a Moscow-based radio station having any validity in this Nation is, for example, ridiculous.

The one thing that can extinguish RFE and quickly rob it of its validity is for these societies themselves to open up real channels of free expression; when that happens nothing will die faster than RFE. Détente of course is welcome, and the greater the détente, the better for all the world. But unfortunately détente has not yet touched the lives and freedoms of most people living in these countries. For altogether too many people the only way they can follow what happens in their own countries, the fact of their own writers, and their own politics, is through RFE.

VIEWS OF EUROPEANS

Most East Europeans I know long for RFE to be phased out—but by Radio Warsaw, Radio Budapest, and Radio Prague becoming real and viable radio stations.

I have one footnote to that. I think in terms of harassment or inflicting the cold war upon individual citizens in the world, that just about the easiest thing in the world to do is to turn off a radio.

COMMENDATION OF WITNESS

Senator PERCY. Thank you very much. I intend to put your statement in the Congressional Record, as an example of the shortest, most provocative, best-stated testimony I have heard in a long time.

RFE AND RL AS BARGAINING POINT WITH RUSSIA

When you said that détente is welcome, the greater détente the better for all the world, I also had in mind this noon to ask the Secretary of State whether at any time during the Brezhnev visit Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were raised as a bargaining point. Did they want us to stop it, did it bother them, did they feel it was worth raising as an issue with us?

I would like to ask the committee staff to address a letter to the Secretary for me asking him that question. I think it should be made a matter of record. If it hinders détente, if it is that much of an irritant, the question should have been raised. I hope that sometime the question of international broadcasts can be raised so that restrictions on the flow of information can be discussed, including jamming. Perhaps we can find ways to enhance the availability of information so the radios can be deemphasized.

I think that the people working for Radio Free Europe and Radio

Liberty, from what they have told me, would be the first to want to get out of this business if they felt the truth were being brought in in some other way.

WITNESS IN BACKGROUND AS REPORTER IN EASTERN EUROPE

Mr. Halberstam, you did work for the New York Times as a reporter in Poland?

Mr. HALBERSTAM. And I covered Czechoslovakia as well. I covered all three countries at the time.

Senator PERCY. You have then known Polish, Czech, and Hungarian newsmen?

Mr. HALBERSTAM. And government officials as well.

PROFESSIONAL LIFE OF NEWSMEN FROM EASTERN EUROPE

Senator PERCY. I had a chance a few years ago to spend a week skiing in Czechoslovakia with the Ski Club Internationale de Journalistes, a group of writers from 10 Western countries and 8 Eastern European countries.

Could you tell us for the record what professional life is like for newsmen from Eastern Europe? Can they report the news as they see it? What are their frustrations? How does their role differ from the role of newsmen in this country?

Mr. HALBERSTAM. It is extraordinarily frustrating, I think, for them. There is no lack of intelligence or sensitivity. Those are very sophisticated societies, with very fine educational institutions and traditions. But the degree of censorship, traditionally, in those countries, is very heavy. The limits of criticism are very sharp indeed. A reporter is occasionally allowed to be critical within a framework. He can complain about the long lines building up around a meat store, or he might be licensed to be critical of the bureaucracy.

In the really broader sense of any criticism of the kind of thing that we take for granted in our society there is really a very sharp limit. I think the better Eastern European correspondents, men of extraordinary sophistication, really champ at the bit, and feel their lives and professional careers are enormously hindered and hampered.

Senator PERCY. I saw those same frustrations when the men skiing with me in Czechoslovakia realized they could speak in candor and not be quoted by name.

CONTROLLED PRESS

I had another experience in South Korea in December when I was met at the airport by about 20 newsmen. I didn't know there was that much of a press corps. There were no Americans present, as far as I could tell. Two hours later on radio, reports were carried which bore no relationship to what I had said. We had to make an official protest saying that we would denounce the reports—and I was there on official business for the Senate. All the reports were the same, as if one person had written the story for all stations.

Apparently that is the way a controlled press works. It was the first direct experience I had with what a controlled press can do, and how 20 men will just wait until one person says what he heard and wants them to say, and that is it for all 20 of them.

Mr. HALBERSTAM. It is extraordinarily frustrating and difficult for them. It becomes almost a kind of a style of how you can write around the center, the oblique ways you can tell and give your readers enough of a sense so that they know what you are talking about. You are almost dancing around the censor. They do that very well. They become very skilled at it.

There are oblique references here and there. They do it almost like a fable occasionally.

VALUE OF RADIO FREE EUROPE TO JOURNALISTS

In addition, one of the interesting things is I think you will find, if you can talk to contemporary 35-year-old Polish or Czech journalists privately he would probably tell you in his heart of hearts, in a secret way, if he knew it wasn't being taped, of the value of Radio Free Europe to him because in a sense it does open up those societies. Radio Free Europe is, indeed, listened to very carefully by the government, the elite, itself. It gives very legitimate channeled information. As the government knows that its society is hearing this material from the external radio from Europe, it has somehow to be accountable to it and, therefore, that opens the door just a little bit more for a Polish and Hungarian journalist. So it is very real to them.

Not only do they listen to it very carefully but they know that it opens the door a bit for them.

IMPACT OF RADIO FREE EUROPE ON JOURNALISTS' ABILITY TO WRITE CANDIDLY

Senator PERCY. What impact, either negative or positive, does Radio Free Europe have on the ability of Polish journalists to write candidly about the national issues that people there are really concerned about? Can you take a specific issue?

And from your experience in any one of these countries, can you cite a specific instance where, if they had been free to write as they saw it, there would have been an entirely different story than was actually reported?

Mr. HALBERSTAM. That will happen every day. In a sense, what you have is a ministry of information which is controlled by the central processes of the government. It is really determining what can be told. Only the knowledge that eventually an accounting will get out through Radio Free Europe in many cases allows the story to be told, be it the trial of a writer—for instance, there was an incident about 2 years ago where, because of the inflation, there was a bit of an uprising, that was in Poland. Everybody who knows anything about Poland knows that that night everybody was listening to Radio Free Europe. Therefore, the moment that information gets out the government finally, almost in self-defense, has to gradually start putting out the story, itself. It has to have some relationship to the truth. That would be an example, I think.

WITNESS' EXPULSION FROM POLAND

I remember when I was expelled from Poland for quite critical reporting in December 1965. I had written very critically of the economic

frustrations and some of the other problems there. The Polish regime expelled me. That night Radio Free Europe simply broadcast and read out the articles that I had written which had caused my expulsion, very tough, very critical, and I think reasonably accurate.

Therefore, instead of the stories which the government put out, which was that I had slandered and libeled the Polish people, that I had been specifically critical of the government, the people that night took the expulsion of the New York Times correspondent as a fairly considerable thing. That night they knew why I was being expelled and my side of the story was given out.

I remember it was right around Christmastime and on New Year's my wife and I went to a very large ball. Everywhere we went we were toasted. I was toasted because of exactly what I had written. The people in that society knew what I had written and knew in a way I had written with some passion on the Poland society. We were treated with honor that night. It was very touching.

PEOPLE RADIO FREE EUROPE APPEALS TO

Senator PERCY. Does Radio Free Europe appeal only to the traditional anti-Communist, anti-Russian elements of the population of East Europe, the disenfranchised?

Mr. HALBERSTAM. No. That is part of the psychology that has grown up in this country going back to the days of 1965. I don't really know, when RFE was more primitive and, of course, our policies in this country were more primitive, that in a sense it was an imagery station. I think the reverse is true. I think the man who controls the Polish desk, for example, is a man extraordinarily sensible to the accountability.

They are, indeed, quite conscious in trying not to be the blind critic of the state. They really down pedal, you might say, any kind of right wing or imagery or exile attitude. Indeed, the total quality is really of people who are living in that society at that time who accept the essential validity of Poland being a Communist country but indeed report what is going on in the Times.

Therefore, it has enormous impacts on the average Polish citizen and has real credibility with young intellectuals. They are sensitive and they are very careful. They are very careful not to blow it. Somebody who gave the old style right wing attitude of: "We have to get back to the prewar days" would have no legitimacy in Poland today because everybody knows those days are past. They know there are certain realities of being in Eastern Europe growing out of the postwar days that are not going to change. They know the limits and parameters of their freedom and possibilities.

I think Radio Free Europe acknowledges those parameters. It understands the limits of what the possibilities are. As such, it has very real credibility with young Poles, not professional anti-Communists or anything, but people who really want a better society, which wants more freedom of expression within the borders of their own country.

FEELINGS OF COMMUNIST PARTY MEMBERS ABOUT RADIO FREE EUROPE, RADIO LIBERTY

Senator PERCY. How about the Communist Party members themselves? How do they feel about Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty?

Mr. HALBERTSAM. They listen to it. It is very important to them. They do a very careful fact sheet on the next day on what was said and it is passed around. For one thing, its reporting is very accurate and they know, therefore, that if that information is gotten out on the airways their society knows what is happening. They don't like it. It is just like, I suppose, any regime in power does not like any kind of critical reporting.

Everybody, I suppose, has his enemy list. They would like to stomp it out. It is the one thing in their society they can't control in any way. It does heighten the aspirations. It does heighten the sophistication and the level of knowledge of their population. It is something that they cannot quite control. Therefore, they have to be accountable, too.

COST EFFECTIVENESS

Senator PERCY. One other area to be considered is its cost effectiveness, a term often used by Secretary McNamara. We will be putting about \$30 million into Radio Free Europe. On the one hand you feel that it is worthwhile, while Paul Bartlett has just testified that because of the jamming he has seen "no hard evidence to convince me that the Soviet or other East bloc masses are reached, certainly not in numbers that justify the present cost."

The implications is that the jamming is effective, that the radios are not getting through to the masses. You have lived in these countries. Can you give us firsthand evidence, as to whether they are getting through and have a large audience?

Mr. HALBERTSAM. I can't speak for Radio Liberty because I have never worked in the Soviet Union, but I was talking specifically about Radio Free Europe. I think it is extraordinarily effective and has great impact, not just on the governmental elite and not just intellectuals. It has an effect on the governmental and the elite because it does touch the masses. I don't think you can really jam the truth. I think you might be able to briefly jam 1 moment or one area, but I think finally that the truth will out. I think it is effective. I think it does touch the masses. I think the news shows are very carefully, very responsibly done. I think those men are extraordinarily careful and responsible about their accuracy.

I think it is done in a Polish framework or a Czech framework or Hungarian framework, not an American one. It is done as if by people still living in those countries.

I remember once I asked John Novak when he left Poland and he said, "In a way I have never left Poland." I am uneasy about the idea of cost effectiveness. It struck me there was a very professional station run by very professional people and run quite well. I had no impression of bureaucratic "fats" around when I was there one or two times. I think those men run on a pretty slim budget. I think it is obviously more expensive because of the devaluation of the dollar.

I think it does touch the masses there. Those people are intelligent and sophisticated. When something like the riots take place the word gets out and they know something is going on. Intuitively people will go to RFE. If there is a news story about anything else they will go to Radio Liberty. That is when it is at its peak.

EFFECT OF LIBERTY IN EASTERN EUROPEAN PRESS, RADIO

The one thing that could really phase it out is for the very societies themselves to start opening up their own radios. In those moments when Prague flowered in 1965—it was not just 1968—the Czech flowering took place over a period of time. I remember going to Czechoslovakia in 1965 and already there was the beginning of liberty in the Czech press and the radio, a new wave of film-making critical of the factories. In the old days, it was love in the factory and now there were new films on alienation.

Radio Free Europe was suddenly not terribly followed because they were getting their own station. Of course, that is the only thing that can phase them out.

GAO STUDIES, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS REPORTS

Senator PERCY. I would like to ask Mr. Bartlett a question.

Have you seen and studied the GAO studies and the Library of Congress reports?

Mr. BARTLETT. I have seen them and have talked to the members of the staff about them, particularly Mr. Dockery. I am aware of them, yes.

Senator PERCY. You do not consider that they provide hard evidence of effectiveness?

Mr. BARTLETT. Not in the sense which is sufficiently satisfactory to me, sir.

Senator PERCY. I will try to find adequate hard evidence for you some place along the line.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you.

RIGHT OF JOURNALISTS TO PUBLISH ESSENTIAL

Senator PERCY. One last question, Mr. Halberstam. How long would Art Buchwald, Mary McGrory, and Herb Block survive in an Eastern European country?

Mr. HALBERSTAM. I would give them about 36 hours.

Senator PERCY. Can I ask the question this way, then: Do you feel that the right of such journalists to publish is essential to a free society?

Mr. HALBERSTAM. It is essential not just to a free society. I remember one night when the Vice President made his first major attack upon the press. My wife, who is Polish, watched him and really, in a way, became frightened, because in a way it was seemingly a reflection of things coming to this society of things that she had known there. I think a free press is terribly important to a society.

RFE EXPEDITES DÉTENTE

You talk about détente and some people say we have to shutoff Radio Free Europe because it is a block to détente. It seems to me quite the reverse is true, that something like Radio Free Europe is a force to make those societies come to terms with their own people. The more they do that and the more they meet the aspirations of their own people's legitimate needs, be they housing, social services, consumer

goods, meat, things that we take for granted, the more tempered they are, the mellower they are, and the safer the whole world becomes.

I think in a funny way it suddenly opens up a détente in a way. I do not think it blocks détente; I think it expedites détente in its own way.

MENTALITY OF MANIPULATION

Senator PERCY. Having lived in and reported from East European countries, do you recognize the same kind of mentality in those who would devise political enemy lists and want to use the resources of agencies of the Federal Government in retaliation against such people?

Mr. HALBERSTAM. I have been extraordinarily struck by how interchangeably some of the men around this particular administration are with some of those.

I knew in Eastern Europe it was a mentality of manipulation, of men fascinated by new technology, an almost antidemocratic mentality, an almost contempt of people. I shouldn't talk that way about the new Polish administration. I think that is really better than its predecessor and I think it is trying to do things in Poland. I haven't been a correspondent in Poland under the present regime. But talking in a broader sense of Eastern European government, yes, I think there has been something deeply antidemocratic about that whole mentality of this particular administration.

COMMENDATION OF WITNESS

Senator PERCY. Thank you very much for being with us. Your testimony is extremely valuable, and I will see that your full testimony is sent to each committee member.

Your comments have been valuable not only for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty, but also valuable for liberty in our own country.

Thank you.

Mr. HALBERSTAM. Thank you.

Senator PERCY. Our next witnesses will be Professor Yuri Glazov, professor at Boston College, and Professor Roman Karst, professor at the State University of New York at Stony Brook.

STATEMENT OF YURI GLAZOV, PROFESSOR AT BOSTON COLLEGE

Senator PERCY. Gentlemen, without objection, your full statements will be put into the record and I would very much appreciate it if you could summarize the major points, each of you taking just a few moments so that we would have time for the questions.

Professor Glazov.

Mr. GLAZOV. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to say I don't know how many minutes you are giving me to express myself.

Senator PERCY. Whatever time we take for the presentation of the statements would then have to come out of the time for questions. What I would like to do is take as much time as possible for the questioning which goes beyond the statements.

I have read the statements, both of them. They have been available for some time to the members of the press and to anyone present. I would like to have, right from your heart for a few moments, what you think would summarize your statement and then we will go right into

questions. But if you feel it is unfair to you not to give time for your whole text, go right ahead.

Mr. GLAZOV. Frankly speaking, being the man from Russia I am trying to show not only the necessity of what we are talking about in these radio stations, but I want to show the internal mechanism that is maybe not understood.

I will try to show that mechanism and maybe spend about 10 minutes, with your permission.

Mr. Chairman, your committee has to determine the fate of two radio stations, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, that has listened already to many eminent personalities concerning the problem in question.

SOVIET RUSSIAN SOCIETY

My approach to the matter will touch some cornerstones of this complex problem on the basis of my growing understanding of the differences between East and West and the difficulties in understanding the two cultures.

I lived in Soviet Russia for 42 years. I was born there, received my education, was engaged in science, protested against repressions, was dismissed from my jobs and was allowed to leave finally.

The closed world of Russia is deprived of free information. Strict control of information is needed to keep brains in a cage and to perpetuate a myth of the socialist state.

There was, in my opinion, in the West misunderstanding of the fact that the Soviet Union is Communist country. Ambitious mediocrities rule over the country. Individuals seeking truth are deprived of information and free visits abroad and have no chance for a precise evaluation of what is going on in their country and the world. Citizens are obliged not only to listen to what is less than accurate but to publicly agree with it and take an active part in manipulating the truth.

All the citizens become blind instruments of the highest institution called the state. High party officials are locked in the system that has been created, and crimes are justified by state interests.

Every citizen is the country's property. The secret police spreads rumors, defends some people and praises others, thinks nothing of creating legends about the West, frequently quoting from the Western one-sided sources. Educated people suffer from informational hunger.

In the country of proclaimed socialism a convinced Communist can hardly be found either in the party institutions where a high salary is paid or beyond the walls of mental hospitals.

Materialistic ideology functions as a ritualistic religion nobody seriously believes in, while the Communist Party still acts like the Catholic Church in the final period of the Middle Ages.

This points to what a peculiar society Russia is. No sane man in Russia still believes that the country is really going to build a society called communism, but nobody is allowed to express publicly on any official level his doubts in dogma.

The ongoing development of the society, however, can be seen at least in the contrast between the present and what took place in the 1930's or the 1940's. Citizens now are no longer prohibited to speak what they really think in a circle of their families or close friends.

But the whole Watergate break-in might seem to Soviet secret police a mere trifle, for Soviet officials are aware of widespread bugging throughout the country.

ATMOSPHERE OF DOUBLE-PATTERNED BEHAVIOR

In the Soviet Union a citizen is obliged to speak in one room things opposite to what he professes in another, according to a specific grammar of double behavior and doubletalking. In the atmosphere of such a double-patterned behavior, secret police stool pigeons function basically as the KGB's hired interpreters who translate from the unofficial language into the official.

No doubt the nightmare situation of the 1930's with their purges and execution has little chance to revive in full scope nowadays in Russia. The society has changed over 20 years in a number of aspects. But a social disease that created a number of giant holocausts has been replaced by another disease where nobody is allowed to talk about the past, and all ought to play a game of social hypocrisy.

The history of the last 20 years in Russia seems to be a series of clashes between a calculated official approach striving to plant consciously a kind of social amnesia and an unofficial approach of thinking individuals who find it impossible to live as liars in a country where a majority feels disgusted by the state-approved myths.

The officials talk much about the importance of official law. However, when in the 1960's more than 1,000 intellectuals in Russia asked the officials to act according to their official or written law, the officials let them know during many unofficial interrogations that the official law had been written only for show, and citizens had better behave themselves on the basis of the unofficial or unwritten law.

So-called dissidents with an unofficial approach begged in their petitions that the officials adhere to their official law and promises. The officials suppressed their opponents with unofficial methods. Stating this in the days of the Watergate crisis, I am not going to say this can only happen in Russia.

A man who manipulates his behavior between what is officially allowed and what he personally and in a closed circle protests against is considered by the society a sane man, though actually he is a kind of schizoid.

If any man is unable to behave himself on these two watertight levels of official and unofficial thinking, speaking and behavior, and proclaims his real thoughts in any official way, he is considered by the officials to be an abnormal man and suffers from one of several possible means of persecution, including confinement to a mental asylum.

In other words, those who are abnormal are considered to be sane; those who are really normal are announced to be insane. The modern Russian society has obviously enriched the lengthy inventory of societal types in the history of humanity.

As the result of such a state of things, the country as a whole in many respects does not know its real situation. Nor do foreigners know much about it because they are far from being active observers of what is going on inside.

GROWTH OF UNOFFICIAL LITERATURE : SAMIZDAT

In the 1960's in Russia a movement of dissent burst forth. If American dissenters appear frequently extreme, openly breaking the law, and still keep their academic and social positions, Russian so-called dissenters have kept loyally to the official law, expressing reserved and loyal opinions, and in the majority of cases they have lost not only their positions in the world of official science and literature but also their freedom or motherland.

The official and state-sponsored literature has been overshadowed by the growth of an unofficial literature that is called samizdat, in other words, self-publishing in the form of typewritten manuscripts.

Educated people of Russia began ignoring the official literature and kept on reading samizdat. Two most outstanding representatives of this unofficial literature were awarded the Nobel Prize, Pasternak in 1958 and Solzhenitsyn in 1970.

The country has needed not only the retrospective attitude manifested in masterpieces of the above-mentioned authors, but also an analysis of modern society and its ties with the West. The first author who dared to do so was Andrei Amalrik who was arrested in 1970 for his "Will the Soviet Union Survive Until 1984?", sentenced to 3 years in a Siberian prison camp and still was not released after his sentence had expired last month.

In the majority of cases, a Soviet citizen would know about a piece of new samizdat literature from the broadcasting of foreign radios, especially Radio Liberty. In spite of several evident successes of samizdat literature, it hasn't succeeded in obtaining the attention it deserves.

The main reason for this is the artificial political and cultural isolation of Russia. The great risks the authors often took did not bring them many readers abroad but did bring them obvious and inevitable blows at home.

The secret police in the country ultimately triumph in their efforts to block the stream of information flowing into the country and out of it. Recent Soviet membership in the Universal Copyright Convention, valid from the end of this last May, may prohibit authors from publishing outside the country without official permission.

The influence of the literature was minimal for several other reasons. In a Western country of freedom with obvious prosocialist sympathies and religious indifference, it is difficult to appreciate numerous efforts of those in Russia who proclaim a new religious zeal and doubts in socialism and its ideology.

DIFFICULTIES INVOLVED IN RUSSIAN DISSIDENTS BEING UNDERSTOOD IN UNITED STATES

It is especially troublesome for Russian dissidents to be understood in America for purely cultural reasons. In a person oriented country where citizens guard their personal space it is difficult to imagine what a state-oriented society is like with a constant invasion into personal space of individuals who share a communal way of thinking.

A dollar-based society with a pluralistic outlook, a rational approach to reality, and a motto "patriotism is a scoundrel's last refuge" is at a loss even to comprehend the mechanism of the ideology-based society

with an enforced one-patterned Weltanschauung and with a necessity for a man to announce his love of the country to everybody so that he may avoid being blamed for association with vigilant enemies and omnipresent spies.

In the country of suppressed wishes where there is no knowledge about Sigmund Freud, the authors who wish to impress the West with their appeals rarely appreciate that their emotional approach may only hurt them.

In a society where the people don't care about expressing their ideas, however shocking and challenging they may be, it is impossible to have even the slightest idea about that compound mechanism of double-patterned behavior.

To understand each other one needs an intermediate language. Otherwise the dialog may remind one of a conversation between two deaf persons or between the deaf and the dumb.

IDEOLOGICAL MECHANISM USED TO PLANT MISUNDERSTANDING

The officials in the Soviet Union and their aides constantly use a fine ideological mechanism to plant an insurmountable misunderstanding between Russia and the West.

With the comprehensive information being locked from the people, the omnipotent secret police may keep under control even the intellectual forces by constantly creating areas of probable miscalculation, underestimation and overestimation for those who vitally need precise evaluation and well-measured actions.

CODED LANGUAGE OF OFFICIAL PRESS

The coded language of the official press can be decoded only by an experienced linguist. Several examples will be sufficient:

If a man in the 30's was sentenced for "10 years of confinement without being allowed to correspond," that meant that he was executed immediately after the trial.

Invading Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, the Soviet officials assured the conquered peoples that the Soviet troops were settled on a temporary basis.

Recollecting this motivation of rendering so-called fraternal assistance to countries where the troops in reality are intended to remain eternally, intellectuals in Russia defined the Soviet tank as the "fraternal ambulance car."

Is it clear that in talking about negotiations between Communist leaders which were carried out in "a friendly and cordial spirit," the official press means to say there was no controversial arguing? At the same time, negotiations being carried out in a "sincere and comradely atmosphere" mean almost an open fight. To say "the meeting voted for this decision unanimously" means that there were those who objected, whereas "voting with one voice" means absence of those who were against it.

As a result, there prevails a serious mutual misunderstanding between Russia and the West with possible dangerous implications. On the one hand some Russians dream to liberate the West from the capitalist yoke; on the other hand, among other Russians prevails the conviction that liberation from their own despotism may come only from the West.

WEST'S PASSIVITY

After the Hungarian revolt of 1956 many citizens of that country were seriously disillusioned at the West's passivity. The same mood dominated in Czechoslovakia and in the circles of Moscow intelligentsia in 1968 and after.

PSYCHOLOGY OF RUSSIANS IN INTERRELATIONS WITH WEST

In the long run, the secret police should be vitally interested that their citizens rely not on their own personal abilities and forces, but what is in a so-called black box. The psychology of Russians in their interrelations with the West may be characterized as an attitude toward a wealthy creditor who is supposed to render a long-awaited gift. These falsely based expectations may easily be transformed into a revenge of disappointment. The free flow of information is the best remedy against this disease.

Americans have had difficulty understanding the double pattern of Russian behavioral psychology. Intellectual dissidents of Russia were identified with American dissidents. In selling grain to Russia, America has seemed to betray the Russian peasant, who has no desire to work hard in collective farms for nothing.

America seems to have functioned like a strikebreaker. Shaking hands with Mr. Brezhnev, Americans implicitly praised him for many crimes including stifling the Soviet intellectuals. In the excess of freedom Americans don't notice the words of those who are deprived of it. Détente is being lauded, and at the same time freedom, the unhindered flow of information and real mutual understanding have been put aside.

RPL, RL GIVE ESSENTIAL EDUCATION

The countries with no free information are looking now at the West, not with a hope for a new crusade against communism but as a source for human dignity, real knowledge and a kind of playback for those writings that cannot be issued there.

Until now, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe have tried to fulfill this task. I recall now that during five summers I spent with my family in Lithuania in a place close to Thomas Mann's summer house on Neringa, our community including 10 different friends—writers, scholars, actors, interpreters, architects, and professors—day after day several times in the morning and just before going to bed listened to Radio Liberty with feelings of eagerness, curiosity, and hope.

A miracle of the recent 20 years, a rebirth of thoughtful Russia, might be impossible without these every day broadcasts. Notwithstanding their shortcomings, they gave an essential education in the country where the truth is hidden as a death of Il'Kashey Immortal, an enigma of Russian fairy tales.

Without exaggeration, listening to Radio Liberty is the greatest pleasure for millions of Russians and non-Russians in the country where I was born. Many may easily survive without a refrigerator or a washing machine, but they would buy a radio set with their first money to listen to what they think is the truth.

I rejoiced with a Hungarian lady of 60 years of age in Trans-

Carpathian Ukraine when she kept on listening to the foreign news. In my presence a Lithuanian priest uttered angry remarks concerning the Russians when in the course of a busy day in the summer of 1969 he learned from the radio that a crew of American spacemen was headed toward the Moon and might collide with a Russian spaceship.

I also recollect how in the beginning of March 1968, when the letter I signed was broadcast by the radio and recited in the proceedings of the Committee for Human Rights in the United Nations by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, I came to my Oriental Institute at the Academy of Sciences and found myself in a Kafkaesque situation, for all members of the institute were looking at me wondering that I was still alive.

A deputy chairman of the institute, Dr. Vadim Solntsev, immediately summoned me to his study and started 2 months of interrogation with the words that more than 10 people had already informed him that they had heard the name of their colleague over foreign radio. I will never forget the midnight of the 21st of August of 1968 when vacationing with my friends on the Baltic seashore, three couples listened intently to the news about the crushing of the Prague spring by Soviet tanks.

We could find no words for expressing disgust and despair when Moscow radio after that praised Soviet troops for rendering "fraternal assistance to a friend in need."

RL SHOULD BE DEVELOPED, DEEPENED, WIDENED, RESTRUCTURED

I am far from praising all the activity of Radio Liberty. Its activity should be developed, deepened, widened, and restructured. Russian and America should enrich each other on the waves of mutual understanding.

Free voices sounded in nonfree countries should be supported by open and nonsecret voices in free countries. To an America that is eager now to embrace rapprochement on the conditions proposed by Moscow a thoughtful and long tortured Russia is looking for a détente with freedom of expression.

I may assure you, Mr. Chairman, that the decision to close Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe would be met with a feeling of deep disappointment by many Russians because this is one of the most important channels of information.

The closure of these informational channels and creation of the area of informational hunger, areas of misunderstanding, miscalculations, creating of artificial myths will be not good. Thank you.

[Biographic sketch of Mr. Glazov follows:]

BIOGRAPHIC SKETCH OF YURI GLAZOV

Yuri Glazov was born December 26, 1929, in Moscow, USSR. He got his education in Moscow, completing secondary school there and graduating in 1952 from the Moscow Oriental Institute. From 1952 to 1957 he worked as senior editor of the State Publishing House of Foreign Dictionaries. In 1957 he returned to his linguistic studies at the Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences and received the degree of Candidate of Philological Sciences (equivalent to an American Ph.D. degree) in 1962 with a thesis entitled "Morphological Analysis of Classical Tamil." He continued as a scholar at the Oriental Institute of the Academy of Sciences until 1968, teaching at Moscow University as professor of Indian linguistics from 1965 to 1968.

Dr. Glazov was expelled from the Academy of Sciences and dismissed from Moscow University in 1968 for signing several protest letters, including the "Appeal of 12 Soviet Intellectuals Against the Suppression of Human Rights in the Soviet Union" sent in February 1968 to the Budapest Consultative Meeting of Communist Parties. He was forbidden thereafter to work in the Soviet Union, although he did free-lance translations from English and French into Russian and wrote three books. After four years living under difficult conditions in Moscow, Dr. Glazov and his family received exit visas to go to Israel and arrived in Rome from the USSR on April 20, 1972. In September of that year he came to New York and commuted between New York and Boston in the spring term of 1973 in order to teach at Lehman College, City University of New York, as an associate professor of Russian Culture, and at Boston College as a visiting scholar and senior lecturer in linguistics and Russian culture. His appointment at Boston College will continue this fall, and Dr. Glazov will also be a visiting scholar at the Harvard Russian Research Center from August on.

Dr. Glazov is married, with three children. He has published over 40 articles and books including numerous works in linguistics, translations from several languages into Russian, historical works and analyses of Soviet literary dissent and moral protest.

Senator PERCY. Professor Karst?

STATEMENT OF ROMAN KARST, PROFESSOR OF GERMAN LITERATURE, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

MR. KARST. Mr. Chairman, I ask you only to allow me to read the last sentence of my statement.

Senator PERCY. Of course.

MR. KARST. I don't wish to take up too much of your time, but I would be glad to answer questions to the best of my ability.

[Mr. Karst's prepared statement and biographic sketch follow:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF PROFESSOR ROMAN KARST

Mister Chairman, honorable Senators, it has been four years since I arrived to this country. I hope to receive my citizenship in the near future.

I left Poland after the dramatic demonstrations by students and intellectuals in 1968 resulted in a wave of repression aimed at intellectuals who were dedicated to the ideals of democracy and freedom—at those who valued the achievements of Western culture.

I left Poland not because I became estranged or indifferent toward her, but because I wanted to live in freedom. Several European universities offered me a chair. I decided, however, to choose America as my new home country, since this is the land where—I firmly believe—one can breathe and live freely.

I am not a politician and I am not used to making public statements.

If I take the liberty today of departing today from this, to ask for a few minutes of your attention, it is because I am deeply worried about the future of the Polish people, threatened by the prospect of being deprived of the free information provided only by Radio Free Europe. I think first of Poland, the country I am so close to and so familiar with, but there is a similar situation in the Soviet dominated countries of Europe.

I was a Radio Free Europe listener in Poland for almost 20 years. In the Warsaw apartment house where I lived (Sarbievski Street No. 2) almost all the tenants, except children and those gravely ill, used to tune in every day to Radio Free Europe programs; they were usually referred to as "Warsaw Four", since Warsaw Radio operates three regular programs.

Millions of people in Poland listened, and still listen, to Radio Free Europe in the big cities, in smaller towns and in the country-side—people in all walks of life—cabdrivers and university professors, workers, writers, doctors, engineers, Poles young and old. Many of them used to start and end their day listening to Radio Free Europe news.

How to explain the popularity of this radio station, located in the West far away from Poland?

This question, which seems quite logical to an American, would hardly be understandable to the average Pole. It is almost like asking a thirsty man why he needs a glass of water.

There is now in Poland no public opinion, in the Western sense of the term, because there is no means by which it can make itself known. There is no free press reflecting different points of view. All the news which the people get is controlled by a censorship system which allows publication of information only if it serves the government and the ruling party. Thirty three million Poles are not allowed to learn anything about their own country or the world, about God, man, hell, good and evil, unless this information has the official blessing.

This is why the Polish people are so keenly interested in anything that is free of the official stamp.

They listen to RFE not because of any abnormal curiosity, not because of their spirit of revolt, not because of an extreme political temperament: they listen to RFE because they simply want knowledge—a desire deeply ingrained in any thinking human being.

Nobody, I am sure, would listen to RFE if there were a truly free Polish TV, radio and press which could be relied upon for objectivity in its formation.

I am fully aware of the difficulty for the average American to understand the tragic situation of those who are deprived of true, reliable information. The American public enjoys the blessings of a free press, radio and TV, and simply cannot imagine what the lack of uncensored news means.

I believe that nations deprived of the ability to think freely, which is possible only on the basis of objective information are in danger of losing, sooner or later, their human and national substance.

This would be a tragedy hard to describe in words; America simply cannot turn its back on one hundred million people threatened by this danger. America cannot refuse them its aid.

I am staunchly against any kind of war, hot or cold. I also believe that any nation must choose the social system which it deems desirable and attainable. I don't think one can make others happy against their will. But this does not mean that one should refuse aid to those who need and want it.

I don't think any reasonable person in America would be against economic aid to Poles, Czechoslovaks or other East Europeans if they were hard-pressed. I suggest that the same principle applies to answering their need for information. I can really assure you that depriving one hundred million East Europeans of these radio programs would be a kind of catastrophe.

I appreciate the opportunity of expressing my opinion on this important subject. I don't wish to take up too much of your time, but I would be glad to answer your questions to the best of my ability.

BIOGRAPHIC SKETCH OF ROMAN KARST

Roman Karst is Professor of German Literature at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Born in Poland in 1911, Professor Karst emigrated to the United States in 1968. Before emigration Professor Karst taught at the University of Warsaw. He was a member of the Polish Union of Writers, the International P.E.N. Club, and was the author of several books and articles published in Polish, German, English, and French. His most important publications include books on Heine, Thomas Mann, Kafka, and Tolstoy. For his critical works he received from the President of Austria the Order of the First Class in the field of Arts and Sciences.

Mr. KARST. If I may, I would like to answer three questions I will ask myself.

Senator PERCY. I yield to you, professor.

Mr. KARST. The first question: Why should an American taxpayer finance Radio Free Europe?

Senator PERCY. Senator Fulbright couldn't have thought of a better one.

Mr. KARST. The second question: Why America and not European countries?

The last question: Why Radio Free Europe and not Voice of America?

Do you agree to hear my answer?

Senator PERCY. I am waiting with baited breath. I think they are excellent questions.

Mr. KARST. Please forgive me, my English pronunciation.

WHY SHOULD U.S. TAXPAYERS FINANCE RFE?

Why should American taxpayers finance Radio Free Europe? In my opinion, for three reasons. First, about 6 million Americans of Polish origin live in this country. The Polish-American Congress which represents about 90,000 of these people support Radio Free Europe because the fate of Polish people who live in Poland is for the Polish-American in this country very important.

Senator PERCY. Do you happen to know how many Americans of Polish origin live in the city of Chicago? I can give you the exact figure: 800,000.

Mr. KARST. I realize. It is the official position of the Polish-American Congress to support Radio Free Europe and the President of the Congress expressed a few times his opinion that Radio Free Europe has to stay alive and work.

The second reason: It seems to me that Polish people in the past and in the present made a big contribution to the development of the American freedom, democracy and independence. I don't have to remind you of the names of Pulaski, and so on.

I don't want to go back in the past, but now thousands of Polish professors, engineers, scholars, writers, and so on, make a lot to develop the ideal and dream in development of this country.

It is a famous saying that every love must be mutual. This is the second reason.

The third reason: I am afraid that not all Americans realize that every day, every hour, every minute Radio Moscow speaks to the Polish people. I speak now for Poland and because this country is the nearest to me and I know the situation. But I think the situation is similar in other Eastern countries.

I repeat every hour that Radio Moscow speaks to Poles in Poland in Polish. It is a Polish saying, "Who is absent is wrong." Mr. Brezhnev said, "We appreciate an economical and political coalition, but we are not for an ideological coexistence." It must be a fight of ideas between both systems.

We have to make this plain. This is a noble battle, a battle of ideas. But if they will make their propaganda the whole day in the Polish language in Poland, and there will not be a complete answer, we will lose the battles.

Maybe the American taxpayer will save \$28 million, \$30 million or \$40 million a year, but this will be a very bitter saving. This country will lose much more—the trust of more than 100 million people in Eastern Europe and partly in Central Europe.

Maybe you don't realize that an American legend—I don't know if it is justified or not—is alive. This is a country of democracy, and this is a big and rich country and a good country which supports the people who need help. You cannot be allowed to lose this confidence.

It will be a catastrophe for 100 million people in Europe, and it will

be, believe me—I don't like phrases—a tragedy for this country. This is my answer why the American taxpayer has to pay taxes and has to support Radio Free Europe.

WHY UNITED STATES, NOT EUROPEAN COUNTRIES?

The second question: Why America not European countries? It seems to me this is a misunderstanding. The European contribution for the Eastern countries is not known, and it is a big contribution that costs much more than \$30 million a year, much more than hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

Do you realize that Polish students, Polish scholars, Polish writers are every year, hundreds by hundreds, invited by France, by West Germany, by England, by Italy and so on. There is a personal contact. The European countries funded grants, stipends, and many other things to enable the contact between the East and the West, between the Eastern and the Western thought.

There is going every year, and I know it from my own experience, a stream of books, of records, of movies to the Eastern countries in different ways. This is the contribution of European countries. Every country does it in its own way.

This personal contact cannot be allowed with America because it is too far, the distance is too great. This is the first reason.

The second reason is it is a very close cultural relationship, for example, between Poland and France. This is a tradition which is about 400 years old and both countries had to develop this tradition. This kind of tradition between, for example, Poland and America doesn't exist.

But Poland and the other countries expect another kind of support of it, and this is Radio Free Europe.

This is why America and not Europe.

Don't think that Europe doesn't do anything. They do a lot and they cannot do more. I am afraid that if we will burden the European countries with this task, it will be a burden on the actions I mentioned before.

WHY RFE, NOT VOA?

The third question was why Radio Free Europe and not Voice of America?

It is very hard to explain to the American people, but let me start with an example. For example, if you are in Warsaw and there is a lawn and we put there a sign that says, "Don't walk across the lawn," people will not go through the lawn. But if you put a sign that says, "the administration forbids people to go on the lawn" all people will go.

Polish people don't like official voices. They have it enough. They are fed by the official propaganda the whole year. In Russia it is about 50 years and in Poland it is about 25 years. There is the same mistrust of official propaganda.

It cannot be useful, this kind of dialog, because the Voice of America will be an American-Polish dialog.

It is better to open the window and to throw out this money. It will be aimless.

Radio Free Europe is a dialog between Poland and Poland, between Polish people and Polish people. For this reason is Radio Free Europe so popular.

I know from my personal experience the Polish broadcasts from BBC, in England; the Polish program from Cologne, West Germany; the French hour, believe me have few people. But millions of people listen to Radio Free Europe. Radio Free Europe presents the facts. Thank you.

COMMENDATION OF WITNESSES

Senator PERCY. Thank you very much. I would like to say to both of you that I am particularly interested in your comments. I was in Poland in 1966 and visited Moscow after going through the Baltic States on that same trip.

EVIDENCE ABOUT EFFECTIVENESS OF JAMMING

I would like to ask both of you what evidence you have about the effectiveness of the jamming. Paul Bartlett has testified that he has no hard evidence that this is a cost-effective program because he says he sees no evidence that it gets through to the masses of the people.

Mr. KARST. I cannot give you direct evidence. It is impossible to make a statistic. I can say only roughly. First, the listeners of Radio Free Europe are the city population, big or small cities. It is less in the countryside.

Senator PERCY. But you think it is available, let's say, in Warsaw?

Mr. KARST. Yes.

Senator PERCY. How effective is the jamming? What particular problem does that create?

Mr. KARST. If you ask me about the sources of democratic opposition, my opinion is it is falling. There is Radio Free Europe, then the Catholic Church, then the intellectual, and then the students.

I put in the first place Radio Free Europe. I can say, roughly, that more than three-quarters of the population of Warsaw listen to Radio Free Europe. Mr. Halberstam spoke about it. The most careful listeners of Radio Free Europe are the members of the Politburo of the Communist Party and all members of the party who have some important position.

This is for them a kind of control because this is a barometer. They cannot say everything and they are not able to make the propaganda which they want because they know that millions of Poles know the opposite. They have to take into consideration what was told yesterday or 3 days ago or a week ago by Radio Free Europe.

AL MAZEWSKI MENTIONED

Senator PERCY. I do want to thank you for mentioning a friend of mine, Al Mazewski, who is with the Polish-American Congress and Polish National Alliance. We are proud of his civil contributions and his contributions to government.

I would like to ask Professor Glazov the same question.

EFFECTIVENESS OF JAMMING

Mr. GLAZOV. I consider that jamming is not effective only in Moscow, Leningrad, and in big cities. It is effective, in my estimation, up to 60 or 70 percent, roughly. But young citizens use special devices of de-jamming and it is not expensive. Usually in Russia it costs only 40 rubles.

In my opinion, in my experience, everybody outside of big cities listen to Radio Liberty, the educated, uneducated, in cities, villages, party members, and nonparty members.

IS R.L.'S USE OF WRITINGS OF DISSENTERS DANGEROUS?

Senator PERCY. Dr. Glazov, you mentioned repression of dissenters, and you have noted that your own petition was broadcast over Radio Liberty and you believe that is what lost you your job.

I think that would mean Radio Liberty is a danger to dissenters. Can you say anything to that point? Is Radio Liberty's use of the writings of dissenters causing them trouble?

Mr. GLAZOV. Here I wanted to show the society. It is a danger. A man whose name has been announced or mentioned in the Radio Liberty would have some troubles. But at the same time, a man whose name is mentioned in the foreign radios is already safe because he may not perish, he may not disappear without any trace, as many people disappeared in the 1930's or in the 1940's.

Also, you should take into account that those people who decided already to open their face in the country, they demand that their petition should be broadcast in the most wide way possible.

CONDITIONS IN POLAND

Senator PERCY. Dr. Karst, you left Poland 4 years ago. Do you believe that the conditions you have described as existing in Poland 4 years ago still exist today?

Mr. KARST. Yes. I have contacts. You understand me, I cannot mention the names. I don't want to bring them into danger. But I met here in this country with very well-known poets, writers, professors, scholars, and they told me so. It is much more better in the economical sphere now, but it didn't change anything in the way of free information. Nothing has changed.

INFLUENCE OF PUBLIC IN EASTERN EUROPE

Senator PERCY. Do you believe that a well-informed population in Poland or anywhere else in Eastern Europe can actually influence Communist leaders in the direction of developing and maintaining better relations with the West?

Does the public have any say or any influence?

Mr. KARST. Yes. Of course, it can be in a different way of influence. It can be a logical influence. It can be sometimes influence by fear, for example in 1970 the riots in Poland, in the bigger cities. You know, this is a very complicated complex of influence. Sometimes the awareness is well known.

A few million people know we cannot do any more. It is very hard

to tell exactly because this is a very complicated chain. But it has its influence.

I would like to add one thing. Sometimes in 5 years they go over and nothing changes, nothing is visible, and the eruption can come. I don't want an eruption with bloodshed, but sometimes it can be a big change which brings in all of the population.

So it works in different ways on the surface and under the surface. This is my answer.

WHAT HAPPENS TO DISSENTERS IN SOVIET UNION?

Senator PERCY. Professor Glazov, when General Secretary Brezhnev was here, we asked him at lunch when he gave the figure that 97 percent of those who had applied to emigrate had been granted visas, about those dissenters who made application and went to jail or were sent to Siberia, and whether that inhibited or reduced the number who actually made application for such visas.

He did not give us what I would consider a satisfactory answer to that question. Would you care to comment on that? What does happen to dissenters in the Soviet Union?

Mr. GLAZOV. I consider the position of the Soviet Union from here a little bit shifted. I consider the position of Jews in the Soviet Union is unbearable and that is why there is an exodus. But somehow the position of the intelligentsia and so-called dissidents is much more worse and their position is not understood here. As far as Jews are concerned, noneducated Jews, mainly Georgians and people from Lithuania, they are allowed to leave the country. But educated Jews, those who have received their Ph. D., and so forth, these people practically are not allowed to leave the country, and usually the officials say that they were engaged in a secret job.

In the Soviet Union practically everything may be secret and it is impossible to prove that they are not secret. My personal 10 friends are not allowed in Moscow to leave the country for Israel.

As far as dissidents are concerned, the Soviet officials tried and succeeded in changing their roles. It is transferring the fish from one tank to another tank. There are some dissidents who don't want it. Other dissidents would like to go abroad, to go to foreign countries, than go to a mental hospital or Siberia. But the Soviet Government behaves according to its own choice. Maybe somebody tries to break psychologically or morally and is not allowed to leave the country.

Practical dissidents already expressed the wish that to be allowed to leave the country is better. It is more humane than to send them to a mental hospital or Siberia. Somehow the Soviet Government hasn't realized or put into action any definite line.

COULD VOA DO JOB NEEDED?

Senator PERCY. Did you listen to the Voice of America in the Soviet Union?

Mr. GLAZOV. Yes.

Senator PERCY. What if there were no Radio Liberty? Arthur Goldberg has suggested that VOA would do the job. Could VOA do the kind of a job that you feel is necessary to be done in the Soviet Union

and in Eastern Europe? Do you feel if Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty were discontinued and just the Voice of America was left, that it could do the same kind of a job or do the kind of a job you think is needed?

Mr. GLAZOV. I consider that these two broadcasting corporations exist, work and function, at least for the Soviet Union listeners, independently. I would say that Radio Liberty is much more popular, first of all, among the general public, the common people, peasants and workers, also among dissidents, because Radio Liberty knows better all these complicated things of the Russian world movement.

As far as the Voice of America was concerned it was not so jammed as Radio Liberty but many things it does not explain as Radio Liberty. That is why I don't find, if I answer your question properly, that they should be absolutely complementary in the good sense of the word. I do hope that Radio Liberty would analyze the Russian society in a new manner and compare it with Western society, which is necessary, and what the Voice of America is not able to do, I suppose.

RESPONSIBILITY OF WESTERN EUROPE

Senator PERCY. Dr. Karst, you have spoken about the responsibility of the United States to help Eastern Europe meet its needs for information. How would you comment on the responsibility of Western Europe to help with this job? Do you think we can look to Western European countries to help in this effort?

Mr. KARST. As I said, there are different ways. The way of the European countries is very useful for the Eastern countries. But it seems to me it would be a catastrophe if Radio Free Europe would be stopped. I don't know if this expression is known here, but America would lose its face. Please do realize people who are in a tragic situation want and cry for help. America is a big power and a big superpower and the contribution is real.

I am afraid that this fact is not so well known here. This would destroy the so-called good American legend. This cannot be estimated by money, not even \$300 billion. There are some words which are much more important than the dollars.

WITNESS' PROTEST ACTIVITIES

Senator PERCY. Finally, Dr. Glazov, you have engaged in protests. What kind of letters did you write and what kind of support did you get from other Soviet citizens when you engaged in your protest activities?

Mr. GLAZOV. I was engaged peacefully in science but then my friends or the friends of my friends were arrested or sent to a mental hospital and I was standing before a moral decision, to sit silent or to send a letter asking, at least, not to send them where they were sent. I had done that several times. Once it was a letter that was sent abroad and broadcast several times 1 week and also was recited in the United Nations organization by Ambassador Arthur Goldberg, with whom I was speaking today and he confirmed it.

This is a peculiar thing. Our process is defending our right to be human beings. It is nothing more and nothing less.

After I had been expelled I was in a kind of isolation for several months, but then I was surrounded by my friends and I received enough warmth, love, and support. I have gotten no support, including financial support, from government. Practically they wanted to freeze me to death, not giving me any job.

COMMENDATION OF WITNESSES

Senator PERCY. Thank you very much, Dr. Glazov and Dr. Karst. You have made a great contribution and the committee is deeply indebted to you.

Our final witness today will be Dr. Ilgvars Spilners of the American Latvian Association, appearing on behalf of the Joint Baltic American Committee.

**STATEMENT OF ILGVARS J. SPILNERS, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN
LATVIAN ASSOCIATION IN THE UNITED STATES, INC.**

Senator PERCY. Dr. Spilners, we welcome you. We are certainly honored to have you as a representative of both the Joint Baltic American Committee and the American Latvian Association. You were twice honored by being chosen for positions of leadership in both of these fine organizations. The president of the Lithuanian-American Council, Dr. Kazys Bobelis, a dear friend of mine, has spoken very highly of you. I have looked forward very much to meeting you and hearing from you.

Mr. SPILNERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for the opportunity given to testify before this committee. My statement is in behalf of the Joint Baltic American Committee, to speak with reference to the authorization for the 1974 budget for Radio Liberty.

INITIATION OF BALTIC LANGUAGE RADIO BROADCAST AT RADIO LIBERTY

I want to emphasize a special situation of the Baltic people in their own homelands and wish to make a special request and explain the basis for this request. The request concerns initiation of Baltic language radio broadcasts at Radio Liberty.

As the Senate Foreign Relations Committee takes up the question of authorization of the 1974 budget for Radio Liberty, the Joint Baltic American Committee respectfully requests that consideration be given to initiation of Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian language radio broadcasts at Radio Liberty.

The need for radio broadcasts in the Baltic languages is recognized by Radio Liberty and the State Department, as shown by the 1974 budget proposal, which included \$270,000 for these broadcasts. However, the entire sum was subsequently eliminated from the budget by the Office of Management and Budget.

Americans of Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian extraction and heritage value highly the human right to know and to be informed. Therefore they have made numerous appeals to their Senators and Congressmen for their continued support of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe and the initiation of Baltic language radio broadcasts at Radio Liberty.

The Joint Baltic American Committee is formed by the Lithuanian American Council, the Estonian American National Council, and the American Latvian Association for joint action and expression of views of Baltic Americans through their nationally elected officers. I have been selected from these elected officers to respectfully ask the committee to adopt the following:

1. A statement of policy that the Baltic language radio broadcasts at Radio Liberty should be initiated at the earliest possible time.

2. A recommendation that supplemental funds should be appropriated for the initiation of the Baltic broadcasts or that part of the appropriated funds should be used for this purpose.

In support of this request I would like to submit the following evidence why the Baltic broadcasts should be initiated and how they would serve the interests of the United States.

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS

Freedom of the press does not mean that every news medium has to include all worthwhile news and opinions to satisfy everybody. It rather means that the conditions allow a sufficient number of different and independent news media, which vary in their interpretation of what is important news and what ideas should be propagated, to exist. This bears on the earlier testimony, Mr. Chairman, and discussions before this committee. I think we get better and more free communications when we have several news media and very many more people have the opportunity to collect news and to communicate that to other people.

This is why I believe that Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe should be kept independent and apart from the Voice of America and should be allowed to operate as freely as possible.

The United States is in a position to trade with the Soviet Union. This trade should not be limited to material values, but should also recognize the interests of the United States in free communications and travel. The Soviet Union is a powerful dictatorship which has at its disposal the greatest and most dangerous arsenal of weapons. Historically, traditionally, and in its mode of operations the Soviet Union is also a continuation of a considerably expanded czarist Russian empire. This means that the masses of people of most of that area have been deprived of free exchange of news and expressions of ideas for many generations. This does make them different from peoples of the Western World.

However, no isolation is complete and we find occasionally a free spirit breaking through the lid of censorship. Mr. Chairman, now I would like to cover the historical background and the present situation in the Baltic States.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND, PRESENT SITUATION IN BALTIC STATES

To convey the significance and meaning of news and communications, such as serviced by Voice of America, Radio Liberty, and Free Europe, to the Baltic people, it is necessary to review the history, culture, and the present situation of the Baltic States. It may give a better insight into the sentiments and character of the Baltic people.

The Baltic people have been much more exposed to different contacts with Poland, Germany, Sweden, Finland, and other Western European countries. This has given them a Western Outlook on civilization.

The Baltic people have been much more exposed to different ideas than, for example, the Russian people. By their nature they are also more individualistic in their character and behavior and have had an experience in democratic government. The Russian people, on the contrary, have lived for centuries only under autocratic or dictatorial governments without opportunity for such experiences.

The Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian languages are very different from the Russian, Ukrainian, and other languages which are used in the broadcasts of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. Written Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian use the Latin alphabet as opposed to the Cyrillic alphabet used in written Russian. The Baltic languages are used by the respective Baltic people in their daily communications, cultural life, and literature, but their use is limited by the orders of the Soviet Government in the affairs of local government, industry, and education. Many Baltic people know some Russian.

Since the Soviet Government imposes the use of the Russian language, this creates resentment and resistance to the acceptance of the Russian language as a means of communication. The Russian language is considered by the Baltic people as a language of their conquerors and masters. Because of this the Russian language Radio Liberty broadcasts heard by Baltic audiences would always be subconsciously or emotionally suspect and would not find the necessary audience acceptance.

The Baltic people do not view their present conflict with the Soviet rule primarily as an ideological struggle but rather as a struggle for survival as nations. The wish of the Baltic people to be independent of the Soviet Union was shown in earlier years of the occupation by armed underground resistance. Since this resulted in large-scale deportations of the Baltic population, the resistance has taken more recently the course of secret as well as open protest and demonstrations. Protests against suppression of religious freedom, Russification by planned excessive industrialization which requires immigration of Russians, and denial of civil rights have come from workers, students, believers and even members of the Communist Party.

In 1961, at the 22d Congress of the Communist Party of the U.S.S.R., a program which outlines the duties of the party with regard to national relations was accepted. It states the following:

The deeply rooted communist system creates a new phase in the relations of nations inside the Soviet Union which is characterized by further national contacts and the achievement of their final complete unity.

The program also explains the need for "wiping out national differences, chiefly the linguistic ones," development of a civilization "common to all Soviet people," encouragement of Russian language as a "common language" of all peoples of the U.S.S.R., waging war against all manifestations of (non-Russian) nationalism, customs, and traditions. Also "national discrimination" against appointment of officers and functionaries of "other nationalities" (that is, Russian nationals) must not be tolerated.

The policy actually reaffirmed the earlier policy statement of Joseph Stalin (1949) and since has been repeated many times by the party leaders, especially in the non-Russian areas.

POLICY OF RUSSIFICATION

The policy of Russification has been carried out by establishing new Russian colonies by displacing non-Russians. For example, the westernmost part of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic in the northern part of the former East Prussia. It is separated from Russia by Lithuania, Latvia, and White Russia. The rapid influx of Russians into the Baltic States, along with the establishment of a Russian colony in East Prussia, is suspected by the Baltic people to have been planned to Russify the Baltic States and secure the area forever as an integral part of Russia.

The Soviet Russian writers are allowed to claim that they carry on the literary traditions of the great Russian writers of the past. The pre-Soviet attitudes of the latter are no hindrance to the publication of their works. But only a very limited number of the pre-Soviet Baltic classical writers are "acceptable." The literary works of "non-acceptable" writers may not be republished regardless of the contents.

Russian children who go to Russian schools in non-Russian parts of the Soviet Union do not need to know the language of the country; but the non-Russian children must have daily Russian lessons.

As a result of the preceding, and many other privileges that the Russians enjoy, the Soviet Union is considered by the Baltic people a continuation of a considerably expanded czarist Russian empire which has been organized according to the communist principles in political, cultural, and economic life. The Soviet Government is aware of the thinking and therefore has tried to keep the Baltic States more isolated from outside contacts with other areas.

POSSIBLE ROLE OF RI BALTIC LANGUAGE BROADCASTS

The Voice of America broadcasts emphasis events in the United States and world events related to the United States interests. Its broadcasts include also programs which link the ethnic interests of people in the United States with the interests of the people of other countries. Voice of America broadcasts in all three Baltic languages and finds a very wide audience in the Baltic States. Numerous personal correspondences and contacts leave an impression that everybody, including the Soviet hierarchy in the Baltic, at some time listen to the Voice of America broadcasts.

The Radio Liberty broadcasts are known to the Baltic people, but they do not find as wide an audience as the Voice of America broadcasts. The Baltic audiences have reportedly received many important and interesting news items from Radio Liberty.

They include the news about self-immolations of Lithuanians as a national protest, demonstrations against the Russian occupation in Lithuania, the letter of protest signed by 17,000 Lithuanians against religious persecution, the letter of protest by Latvian communists against Russification, excerpts from the underground Chronicle of the Catholic Church of Lithuania, and reports of persecutions and imprisonment of individual Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians.

Radio Liberty has prepared research papers on different aspects of present-day life in the Baltic area.

If Radio Liberty would broadcast regularly in the Baltic languages, its audiences in the Baltic area would increase many more times. The

basis for this anticipation is the interest of the people of this area in happenings in their homelands and adjoining areas about which the Soviet Government does not report. Since the news reports in the Soviet press, radio, and television consist to a large part of formal government announcements of wordy and ideological speeches, news analysis and commentary on the news would also be a significant attraction. Even reading of old classical or forbidden present-day Baltic literary works would attract new audiences.

This opportunity to learn more about news near home, the forbidden phases of history and the past and present literature has been given to many people for many years by the broadcasts of Radio Liberty in 18 different languages. The same opportunities, however, have not been given to Baltic audiences.

GENERAL POLICY RESPECTING STATUS OF BALTIC STATES

Radio Liberty was created to broadcast to the Soviet Union. The United States Government and the Baltic people do not recognize the Baltic States as a part of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the Baltic language broadcasts, if such would be authorized and initiated, should be directed to the "Lithuanian," "Estonian" and "Latvian" people but not to "Soviet Lithuanians," "Soviet Estonians" and "Soviet Latvians." To find any acceptance by Baltic audiences and support by Baltic Americans, Radio Liberty would have to follow the same policy of nonrecognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union as the Voice of America is following now.

[Dr. Spilners' prepared statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DR. ILGVARS J. SPILNERS

INITIATION OF BALTIC LANGUAGE RADIO BROADCASTS AT RADIO LIBERTY

As the Senate Foreign Relations Committee takes up the question of authorization of the 1974 budget for Radio Liberty, the Joint Baltic American Committee respectfully requests that consideration be given to initiation of Lithuanian, Estonian and Latvian language radio broadcasts at Radio Liberty.

The need for radio broadcasts in the Baltic languages is recognized by Radio Liberty and the State Department, as shown by the 1974 budget proposal, which included \$270,000 for these broadcasts. However, the entire sum was subsequently eliminated from the budget by the Office of Management and Budget.

Americans of Lithuanian, Estonian and Latvian extraction and heritage value highly the human right to know and to be informed. Therefore they have made numerous appeals to their senators and congressmen for their continued support of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe and the initiation of Baltic language radio broadcasts at Radio Liberty.

The Joint Baltic American Committee is formed by the Lithuanian American Council, the Estonian American National Council and the American Latvian Association for joint action and expression of views of Baltic Americans through their nationally elected officers. I have been selected from these elected officers to respectfully ask the Committee to adopt the following:

(1) A statement of policy that the Baltic language radio broadcasts at Radio Liberty should be initiated at the earliest possible time.

(2) A recommendation that supplemental funds should be appropriated for the initiation of the Baltic broadcasts or that part of the appropriated funds should be used for this purpose.

In support of this request I would like to submit the following evidence why the Baltic broadcasts should be initiated and how they would serve the interests of the United States.

FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS

Freedom of the press does not mean that every news medium has to include all worthwhile news and opinions to satisfy everybody. It rather means that the conditions allow a sufficient number of different and independent news media, which vary in their interpretation of what is important news and what ideas should be propagated, to exist.

We can find a very wide acceptance, at least in the United States and Western Europe, of the principle that freedom of the press is essential to the existence of a free society. This holds true in respect to the relations of the people within one nation and also of the people of different nations. This principle is based on the experience that communications, contacts, and exchange of ideas help in a long run to give a better life to everybody and lessen tensions among peoples and governments. It is true that in a short run, at least in the initial stages and in communications with people who are not used to free exchange of ideas, some strong differences may result. But these differences are less dangerous than a perpetuated state of ignorance where people do not know each other and do not know what is happening in their own country and elsewhere. A state of widespread ignorance is a "buffer of nitroglycerin" between people.

The declared United States Government policy in relation to the forthcoming Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe is that there should be taken specific steps to encourage the free movement of people, ideas and information. It is a fact of life that the Soviet Union is denying these opportunities of freedom to the people under their direct and indirect rule. It is also true that the Soviet Union is denying these opportunities of freedom to all other people who may want to have a closer and freer contact with the people under direct or indirect Soviet rule. However, it does not have to mean that we have to accept the present Soviet position or that it may not be influenced to undergo future changes.

The United States is in a position to trade with the Soviet Union. This trade should not be limited to material values, but should also recognize the interests of this United States in free communications and travel. The Soviet Union is a powerful dictatorship which has at its disposal the greatest and most dangerous arsenal of weapons. Historically, traditionally and in its mode of operation the Soviet Union is also a continuation of a considerably expanded czarist Russian empire. This means that the masses of people of most of that area have been deprived of free exchange of news and expressions of ideas for many generations. This does make them different from peoples of the Western World.

However, no isolation is complete and we find occasionally a free spirit breaking through the lid of censorship. It may survive for a little while to be stamped out again. Right now the Soviet Government is trying harder than ever to find and capture all dissidents and end all publications which have not been authorized by the Soviet Government. Our sympathies should be with the free spirit and not with the censorship and our actions should speak for these sympathies. This is why the Baltic Americans, as represented by the Joint Baltic American Committee, support Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe and Voice of America.

The quality and character of our own society does not depend only on what we do in our own communities but also what our attitudes and positions are in relation to others. If we use different yardsticks in different places, we will lose credibility at home and abroad.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND THE PRESENT SITUATION IN THE BALTIC STATES

To convey the significance and meaning of news and communications, such as serviced by Voice of America, Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe, to the Baltic people, it is necessary to review the history, culture, and the present situation of the Baltic States. It may give a better insight into the sentiments and character of the Baltic people.

The Baltic people in their history have had continuous contacts with Poland, Germany, Sweden, Finland, and other Western European countries. This has given them a Western outlook on civilization.

The Baltic people have been much more exposed to different ideas than, for example, the Russian people. By their nature they are also more individualistic in their character and behaviour and have had an experience in democratic government. The Russian people, on the contrary, have lived for centuries only under autocratic or dictatorial governments without opportunity for such experiences.

The Lithuanian, Estonian and Latvian languages are very different from the Russian, Ukrainian and other languages which are used in the broadcasts of Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe. Written Lithuanian, Estonian and Latvian use the Latin alphabet as opposed to the Cyrillic alphabet used in written Russian. The Baltic languages are used by the respective Baltic people in their daily communications, cultural life, and literature, but their use is limited by the orders of the Soviet Government in the affairs of local government, industry, and education. Many Baltic people know some Russian.

Since the Soviet Government imposes the use of the Russian language, this creates resentment and resistance to the acceptance of the Russian language as a means of communication. The Russian language is considered by the Baltic people as a language of their conquerors and masters. Because of this the Russian language Radio Liberty broadcasts heard by Baltic audiences would always be subconsciously or emotionally suspect and would not find the necessary audience acceptance.

The Baltic people do not view their present conflict with the Soviet rule primarily as an ideological struggle but rather as a struggle for survival as nations. The wish of the Baltic people to be independent of the Soviet Union was shown in earlier years of the occupation by armed underground resistance. Since this resulted in large scale deportations of the Baltic population, the resistance has taken more recently the course of secret as well as open protest and demonstrations. Protests against suppression of religious freedom, Russification by planned excessive industrialization which requires immigration of Russians, and denial of civil rights have come from workers, students, believers, and even members of the Communist Party.

In 1961 at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR, a program which outlines the duties of the Party with regard to national relations was accepted. It states the following:

"The deeply rooted communist system creates a new phase in the relations of nations inside the Soviet Union which is characterized by further national contacts and the achievement of their final complete unity."

The program also explains the need for "wiping out national differences, chiefly the linguistic ones", development of a civilization "common to all Soviet people", encouragement of Russian language as a "common language" of all peoples of the USSR, waging war against all manifestations of (non-Russian) nationalism, customs and traditions. Also "national discrimination" against the appointment of officers and functionaries of "other nationalities" (i.e., Russian nationals) must not be tolerated.

The policy actually reaffirmed the earlier policy statements of Joseph Stalin (1949) and since has been repeated many times by the party leaders, especially in the non-Russian areas of the Soviet Union.

The policy of Russification has been carried out by establishing new Russian colonies by displacing non-Russians. For example, the westernmost part of the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic in the northern part of the former East Prussia. It is separated from Russia by Lithuania, Latvia and White Russia. The rapid influx of Russians into the Baltic States, along with the establishment of a Russian colony in East Prussia, is suspected by the Baltic people to have been planned to Russify the Baltic States and secure the area forever as an integral part of Russia.

The party leadership, cabinet posts and industry are dominated by appointed Russians arriving from the outside of the Baltic States. They are given special privileges in selection of living quarters which are very scarce. Russian dominance in the leading positions in government, party, and the diplomatic corps is typical of the whole Soviet Union.

The Soviet Russian writers are allowed to claim that they carry on the literary traditions of the great Russian writers of the past. The pre-Soviet attitudes of the latter are no hindrance to the publication of their works. But only a very limited number of the pre-Soviet Baltic classical writers are "acceptable". The literary works of "non-acceptable" writers may not be republished regardless of the contents.

Russian children who go to Russian schools in non-Russian parts of the Soviet Union do not need to know the language of the country; but the non-Russian children must have daily Russian lessons.

As a result of the preceding, and many other privileges that the Russians enjoy, the Soviet Union is considered by the Baltic people a continuation of a considerably expanded czarist Russian empire which has been organized according to the

communist principles in political, cultural and economic life. The Soviet Government is aware of this thinking and therefore has tried to keep the Baltic States more isolated from outside contacts than other areas.

THE POSSIBLE ROLE OF RADIO LIBERTY BALTIC LANGUAGE BROADCASTS

The Voice of America broadcasts emphasize events in the United States and world events related to the United States interests. Its broadcasts include also programs which link the ethnic interests of people in the United States with the interests of the people of other countries. Voice of America broadcasts in all three Baltic languages and finds a very wide audience in the Baltic States. Numerous personal correspondences and contacts leave an impression that everybody, including the Soviet hierarchy in the Baltic, at some time listen to the Voice of America broadcasts.

The Radio Liberty broadcasts are known to the Baltic people, but they do not find as wide an audience as the Voice of America broadcasts. The Baltic audiences have reportedly received many important and interesting news items from Radio Liberty. They include the news about self-immolations of Lithuanians as a national protest, demonstrations against the Russian occupation in Lithuania, the letter of protest signed by 17,000 Lithuanians against religious persecution, the letter of protest by Latvian communists against Russification, excerpts from the underground Chronicle of the Catholic Church of Lithuania and reports of persecutions and imprisonment of individual Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians.

Radio Liberty has prepared research papers on different aspects of present day life in the Baltic area.

If Radio Liberty would broadcast regularly in the Baltic languages, its audiences in the Baltic area would increase many more times. The basis for this anticipation is the interest of the people of this area in happenings in their homelands and adjoining areas about which the Soviet Government does not report. Since the news reports in the Soviet press, radio and television consist to a large part of formal government announcements of wordy and ideological speeches, news analysis and commentary on the news would also be a significant attraction. Even reading of old classical or forbidden present day Baltic literary works would attract new audiences.

This opportunity to learn more about news near home, the forbidden phases of history and the past and present literature has been given to many people for many years by the broadcasts of Radio Liberty in 18 different languages. The same opportunities, however, have not been given to Baltic audiences.

GENERAL POLICY WITH RESPECT TO THE STATUS OF THE BALTIC STATES

Radio Liberty was created to broadcast to the Soviet Union. The United States Government and the Baltic people do not recognize the Baltic States as a part of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the Baltic language broadcasts, if such would be authorized and initiated, should be directed to the "Lithuanian", "Estonian" and "Latvian" people but not to "Soviet Lithuanians", "Soviet Estonians" and "Soviet Latvians". To find any acceptance by Baltic audiences and support by Baltic Americans, Radio Liberty would have to follow the same policy of non-recognition of the incorporation of the Baltic States into the Soviet Union as the Voice of America is following now.

CONCERN ABOUT PEOPLE IN BALTIC COUNTRIES

Senator PERCY. Thank you very much, Dr. Spilners.

I visited the Baltic countries in 1966 and went to Moscow afterward. I was asked by Soviet officials in Moscow whether I had visited the government in those countries. I said no, I had not, and they said, "We are disappointed. Why not?" I said, "We don't recognize your government as the government of the Baltic countries." I made the same statement to the press and on radio, and challenged those who were interviewing me to carry it.

I had a letter from one of them, and I won't identify him, saying,

"We did, just to accept the challenge," but I know it was done, if it was done, with some trepidation.

I did a Soviet television interview in my office the other day concerning the Brezhnev visit, and I incorporated once again my strong feelings about minorities in the Soviet Union, about the emigration problem, and mentioned also my deep concern about those in the Baltic countries and Ukraine. I am not sure whether they will use that statement in the broadcast or not, but I would hope so.

I think we share a very deep concern about this. My own impression in Latvia and Lithuania was that, to a remarkable degree, the people of those countries are preserving their customs, their culture, their national holidays, and their languages.

The language that they want to use is their own. I pay great tribute to those people who have an absolute right to maintain their heritage. I would hope as there is an increasing liberalization through increasing contact with the West that we can use moral persuasion in every contact with the government of the Soviet Union to impress upon them our deep, strongly-held feelings about the need for freedom and the fact that we simply do not and will not recognize other than the Baltic countries' existence and the peoples' right to have loyalties to their own form of government.

APPEAL OF LITHUANIAN CATHOLIC BROADCAST BY RL

I fully support what you have said about the Baltic languages. I will certainly, to whatever extent I can as a Senator, talk with the Board of International Radio Broadcasting, when it is established, to make the best representations that I can.

While I will assure the Board ahead of time that simply because I have authored this legislation I expect no more consideration than any other U.S. Senator, I will present as many arguments as I can based on reason, but of course will leave the decision in their hands.

I think it is a budgetary matter, primarily. I would hope we can find other areas where we can make economies in order to achieve broadcasts in the Baltic languages. It is a matter of priorities, and I place very high priority on this.

SIMAS KUDIRKA

On another subject, could you tell me what happened to the very brave seaman, Simas Kudirka. Have you any word of him at all? Where is he now?

Mr. SPILNERS. He tried to escape from a Russian fishing trawler on the New England coast. He reached an American ship and he was recaptured by the Russians on the American ship.

Senator PERCY. How long is his sentence?

Mr. SPILNERS. I cannot say definitely. I have a record someplace, but it was certainly a many-year sentence. He was sent away to a prison camp just for trying to escape the Soviet rule. During his trial he steadfastly refused to admit any guilt and proclaimed that he is a Lithuanian and he is resisting the Soviet-Russian rule in Lithuania. I believe his steadfastness against the Russian occupation caused him a much more severe sentence than he would otherwise have received. But he did not yield.

Senator PERCY. I know the tendency is to focus attention for a few days or a few editions of a newspaper on an incident of this kind. I felt that Simas Kudirka took this great risk and proved his bravery as a symbol that though we see improvements and tendencies in the right direction, we are a long way from achieving in practice the right of all people to have political asylum. I hope that Simas Kudirka knows that his courageous act served a very useful purpose. I hope that we will never forget that this man took great personal risk in the cause of freedom.

I would hope that you could possibly help get some letters to the city council and to Mayor Daley in Chicago. I have proposed that one of our major streets be renamed for Kudirka. That would be a lasting reminder of his bravery and valor.

APPEAL OF LITHUANIAN CATHOLIC BROADCAST BY RL

A year or two ago, I believe some 17,000 Lithuanian Catholics signed their names to an appeal to the United Nations for support of their human rights and rights under the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. to practice their religious faith. Do you have any basis to believe that the signers of that appeal deemed it important that Radio Liberty broadcast the appeal in full to all the peoples and regions of the Soviet Union?

Mr. SPILNERS. I definitely believe so. There is a Lithuanian Catholic underground newspaper which occasionally reaches the Western World. I believe some of the ideas are presented in this underground paper which may be the result of getting a general inspiration to think about ideas of freedom and human values. I think some of the people in Lithuania certainly get news through Radio Liberty today, as I mentioned. But because of not having any Lithuanian or Latvian or Estonian broadcast it does not give as much benefit to these areas as if they had their own language broadcast.

COMMENDATION OF WITNESS

Senator PERCY. Dr. Spilners, I want to thank you very much. We are grateful to you and to all of our witnesses who have seen fit to be here today to help us.

FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE ACTION

I am very happy to say that yesterday the Foreign Relations Committee voted 8 to 2 to authorize a supplemental appropriation of \$1,150,000, to take care of the additional costs created by devaluation. I reported it to the floor last evening. By voice vote the Senate unanimously passed it. That is the authorization bill. The Appropriations Committee had already included it in the supplemental, but that was the supplemental vetoed by the President.

We will have to work this out, but I am sure we are going to work it out. I think that is good progress.

168
COMMENDATION OF CHAIRMAN

Once again, I wish to express appreciation to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright, who although he is in opposition to the authorization for fiscal 1974, has been extremely fair in seeing that we had a full set of hearings, a day and a half of hearings, and we did work yesterday until we had a quorum so that we could vote on the supplemental. I think that is in the greatest tradition of the U.S. Senate, to make certain that the democratic process rules.

And 8 to 2 was a very good vote for Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty.

These hearings are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 5 p.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

APPENDIX

STATEMENT FOR U.S. SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON S. 1914

(By Dr. Maury Lisann, Rockville, Md.)

A question that has been repeatedly asked by members of the Committee is what evidence is there that Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe broadcasts actually reach their audience in Eastern Europe and what influence do they have on the policies of the countries. The replies were both positive and negative, but were similar in being imprecise on specifics.

Averell Harriman firmly cited his experience in dealing with the Soviets for his knowledge that public opinion does influence Soviet policies and that even Stalin had not been able to ignore it. Apart from the matter of specific issues at particular times, the general existence of an informed body of public opinion would act as an anchor or ballast on any propensity to adopt risky or adventurous policies, for the simple reason that skepticism about official information would prevent the leaders from automatically justifying any action or sacrifice by the public, unhampered by questions. As the Presidential Study Commission put it, it is "that peace is more secure in well informed societies and that uninformed societies may more easily be manipulated in directions threatening world peace."

Paul Bartlett told the Committee that there was no evidence that broadcasting had any effect in East Europe. Others, former residents of the area, provided many examples of their own and friends' interests in the broadcasts, as well as extensive hearsay evidence, but, according to Dr. Roman Karst, there are, unfortunately, no Gallup polls that could provide the kind of "hard" evidence in which the Committee is interested.

In fact, there are such polls, even if Dr. Gallup did not conduct them, and though they do not meet the standards of reportorial fullness or precision in figures to which Western social reporting has become accustomed. They do, however, provide some "hard" evidence, after allowing for five to ten percentage points of fuzziness around the edges and a certain deliberate obfuscation in the manner in which they were reported.

These polls, which the Soviet Union began to conduct about 1966, were instituted, according to the Soviets' own specialists, in large part because of a growing problem with foreign radio broadcasts, even to the point that research about television had to cede precedence to radio, despite the obvious fact that television was about to become the more important internal medium.

Only the results of the first several years of this polling are available, and these only partially. The reason is clear. The situation uncovered was so distressing that continued publication of the results, although probably not the polling itself, was suppressed. These polls probably were a major cause of the decision to reinstitute jamming of most foreign radio broadcasts in 1968. From 1963 to 1968 the Soviets had felt confident enough about foreign radio to discontinue most jamming, with the exception of Radio Liberty, which remained the only station continually jammed.

At first, the polls avoided direct questioning about foreign radio broadcasts. Instead, they were designed to measure the interest in the domestic media, and, in a roundabout, fragmentarily reported, way, the general credibility of the official, i.e. the only approved, sources of information.

Two significant trends emerged quickly. All Soviet polls, without regard to place, group, or time, showed that the main interest of the public in news was for news about international affairs. These were the sections of the newspapers and the types of magazines that were most read. The polls did not ask why, but some analysis showed displeasure. One Soviet commentator called this interest "unhealthy." In the background, certainly, was the unspoken fact that public interest was pointed into the area where foreign radio had its strongest potential for competition.

A second trend which emerged from the polls early was an indication of considerable public dissatisfaction with the performance of the Soviet press and other official sources of information. The best estimate that can be pulled together from the bits and pieces revealed by a number of widely separate and disparate polls is that 20 to 30 per cent of the public were willing to go on record as being generally incredulous of any official information, while only 40 to 50 per cent were completely satisfied in this respect. The remainder either did not care or refused to reveal their opinions.

Since other polls, neutral and avoiding sensitive subjects, rarely showed much over 20 per cent genuinely disinterested in news and public affairs, it appears that 10 to 20 per cent chose to conceal their opinions in this area. It is much more likely that such concealed opinion was negative than positive.

Some examples of the types of dissatisfaction that appeared in these polls follow. Up to 25 per cent of a large group of trainee propagandists, given a chance to evaluate their courses anonymously, indicated that they did not believe the information they were being called on to dispense. In Estonia, only 27 per cent of the audience was satisfied with the speed with which the local radio reported the news. From 20 to 40 per cent were dissatisfied in varying degrees with the work of the local radio in this regard. In Leningrad 29 per cent of the television audience were dissatisfied with either the speed or honesty of television news. Up to 39 per cent regretted that they had even bought a television set, and of 12 different categories of programs, substantial dissatisfaction was expressed only with news and public affairs. In Sverdlovsk, the answers to separate questions could be combined to indicate that, even after excluding those who were not interested, 21 to 25 per cent of the television audience considered the news not to be worth watching.

The connection of such figures with foreign radio broadcasts is mainly in the basis used by the public for comparisons, especially in categories like promptness of reporting. While the Soviet public has a number of unofficial sources of news, such as contacts with foreign tourists, foreign students in Soviet institutions, exhibits, etc., it is clear that the widespread awareness of the slowness of Soviet news could only come from familiarity with reports from foreign radio broadcasts, and indeed, the official reporting of the Estonian polling took note of this, while regretting that the relevant direct questions on this subject had not been asked.

These polls reflect opinion from below, but testimony also comes from above, when, shortly before jamming was resumed, the top organs of the Party began to give vent to opinions on the effects of foreign broadcasts, which were normally never aired in public at this level, by local officials of the Central Committee's Department of Propaganda, the body directly responsible for counteracting foreign broadcasts. One such view, from *Kommunist*, the main theoretical organ of the Central Committee, follows.

Now, everyone has radio receivers—you listen to whom you want and as much as you can stand. Only some, although very few such, listen and are off: to somewhere 'there'—that other, beautiful, life . . . Of course . . . this certainly does not mean that a bad man is in front of us. Simply sometimes he believes the tales, or else, even when not believing them, begins to wag his tongue. Some only 'wag,' but some take it seriously. And after that, from the alien voice, he goes off to convince others, to tell all sorts of fables. So one must clear up all this at the very beginning. Here no one will replace the Communists.

Before such expressions were allowed to appear in journals of great authority the Party already had in hand the results of what it said was the first poll ever made of the direct effects of broadcasting in the area of international affairs. It was also, as far as public disclosure was concerned, the last. Conducted under the relatively bland heading of "sources of international information," it queried more than 5,000 interviewees, carefully selected by "statistical grouping" techniques to be a geographical and social-economic cross-section of the country.

Asked what it was about Soviet broadcasts of international news and analysis that interested them, the largest response was that it was the opportunity to compare the Soviet versions of events with foreign radio broadcasts. The percentage expressing this interest ranged from 49 for collective farmers to 75 for students, with ordinary workers and engineering-technical personnel falling in between at 57 and 72 per cent respectively. This represents the minimum number who hear about the news reports of foreign radio, although it is unlikely that nearly that proportion are listening directly, if only because there were not enough short wave radio receivers available at the time. In all classes this was the

most important reason for listening to international news; the second most important was to get concrete facts from Soviet broadcasts, and third was interest in analyses and commentaries, this generally getting only a little more than half as much interest as comparisons with foreign broadcasts. The poll also confirmed the frequently reported impression that officials were the most interested of all in the contents of foreign broadcasts. Over 81 per cent of "Party and government officials" replied that they were interested, although it can be presumed that many of these could get the information by other means than those used by the general public.

The poll then asked whether the listeners considered that Soviet broadcasts satisfactorily answered foreign broadcasts. Except among collective farmers there was a large negative response. It ranged from a minimum of 31 per cent of the workers, to 47 per cent of the students, and 49 per cent of engineering-technical personnel. These figures are minimums, because the ambiguous way in which they were reported left open the possibility that they were actually higher.

Thus, the Soviets confirmed what they already suspected, that they had a massive credibility problem, and it could be attributed in large part to foreign radio broadcasts.

The trends measured by these Soviet polls refer not to a single station, of course, but to the totality of Western broadcasting. The Soviets have been careful never to be too specific about individual stations effects, other than claiming that there are about 35 "hostile" broadcasters, almost half apparently never named. Figures provided by the Presidential Study Commission (p. 19) suggest that RL and RFE are responsible for about 55 per cent of all Western broadcast hours to East Europe.

The only quantitative measures of the Soviet estimates of the relative importance of the different stations have been developed by counting the number of Soviet attacks on them. This is usually not proportional, however, because Soviet publications have specialized roles in the various counter-campaigns, and they vary for reasons not connected with the individual importance of the stations themselves. But there was one Soviet magazine, *RT*, which, before public rejection caused its collapse and alteration, had a primary assignment of countering all foreign radio broadcasting. Its editors may have had secret polls to guide them in the selection of targets. The figures that can be derived from *RT*'s work suggest the following Soviet estimate of the relative importance of individual foreign broadcasters: Radio Liberty—30 per cent; Voice of America—30 per cent; BBC—15 per cent; Deutsche Welle (official station of West Germany)—15 per cent; all others—10 per cent.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE LITHUANIAN-AMERICAN COMMUNITY OF THE U.S.A., INC. SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The National Executive Committee of the Lithuanian-American Community of the U.S.A., Inc. strongly supports Senate Bill 1914 sponsored by Senators Percy and Humphrey and urges favorable action thereon.

This Bill recognizes the continuing need to disseminate current world-wide news to the people of Eastern Europe. This broadcasting is consistent with the policy adopted by all members of the United Nations in accordance with Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This Bill provides for the establishment of the Board for International Broadcasting to administer the broadcasting operations of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and this Board will control all Congressionally authorized funds.

The policy and purpose of Senate Bill 1914 is in total concert with the current U.S.-Soviet détente, and reinforces the basic tenets of the Jackson Amendment (co-sponsored by 3/4 of the Senate). The Broadcasting of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is a positive contribution to the free exchange of ideas which fosters knowledge and understanding on a people to people basis and creates another plank in the platform of a meaningful détente.

The Report of the Presidential Commission on International Radio Broadcasting entitled "The Right to Know" provides a complete and detailed analysis of the operation of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty and bears testimony to the continued value of them both.

It is noted that this Bill will maintain the broadcasting of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty at their current levels, however, provisions should be made to include native language broadcasts to the Baltic States, already overdue, and should be of prime concern to this Committee.

We respectfully urge this Senate Foreign Relations Committee to include specific provisions and recommendations for native language broadcasts by Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty to Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia in the implementation of this Bill.

Respectfully Submitted,

AUSRA M. ZERR,
Activities Director.

JULY 2, 1973.

STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS HEARINGS CONCERNING RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY BY PROF. EUGEN LOEBL

In thinking about the role of Radio Free Europe, I cannot help but recollect a scene on July 4, 1956, in one of the concentration camps in Czechoslovakia, where the prisoners—mostly like myself political prisoners—had to mine uranium to be delivered to the Soviet Union practically free of charge. The prisoners managed to get hold of some paint and paper, and painted hundreds of American flags, and posted them all over the camp. A hunger strike followed for a week: practically all of us refused either to eat or to work. This demonstration which was one of many that took place in similar camps. It was not incited by Radio Free Europe. It happened spontaneously, because of a belief that the world at large is interested in the right of self-determination of any nation.

The situation in Czechoslovakia has basically changed; so has the situation in the world at large. But still there are some constant factors: one is the desire of every nation to live as a community of free people and not be subordinated to the power interests of a more powerful nation. Another factor is that subordinated nations—although they realize that neither cold nor hot war are proper ways to free themselves—still need assurance that interest in their freedom is still alive in the world, and that statements to this effect made by politicians of the West are not mere rhetoric.

Radio Free Europe is not to be looked on only as an information agency, or one of many information agencies, but has to be understood in this wider context. It is a proof that the idea of self-determination is not abandoned. If one day Radio Free Europe did not exist or function, it would not mean only that there was less information available. But in losing this one source information, I am afraid the people in Czechoslovakia would lose the feeling that they could rely on any statement of the West, particularly of the USA.

I would like to emphasize the basic difference between the quality of information Radio Free Europe offers, and other information. The information that Radio Free Europe gives is information from friends speaking to friends in their language—not merely from the grammatical point of view but from the point of view of the spirit. This information is based on thorough knowledge and analysis of the problems and situation in Czechoslovakia, and no other source of information is able to match this subtle distinction. The broadcasting of Radio Free Europe creates a spiritual link and gives encouragement by its very existence.

It should be noted that numbers of Party leaders receive regular monitoring reports with excerpts from RFE broadcasts. Thus RFE exerts a double influence: It informs Party officials about how the West reacts to developments in Czechoslovakia, and simultaneously it keeps the broad public informed and thus encourages the people to continue to try to influence Party policies.

In the present period of detente the role of RFE becomes even more important. On the part of the East European regimes there exists the obvious tendency to maximize the benefits of detente but, on the other hand, to strictly limit Western ideological influence on the home front. As long as the West wants to preserve its ideals, it must endeavor to extend detente to all fields of culture. If measures taken by the Czechoslovak government were constantly confronted with the spirit of detente, then the leadership would find it increasingly difficult to sabotage a real detente, especially in the field of culture. Thus RFE should not play the part of an opposition, but rather of an agency which takes the spirit of detente seriously and fights for its realization.

I would like only to add that although for the last two years I haven't been able to listen to Radio Free Europe, I am in frequent contact with friends in Czechoslovakia. I am basing my judgments not only on my personal experiences, but also on information I am regularly receiving from Czechoslovakia.

BIOGRAPHY OF PROF. EUGEN LOEBL

Professor Eugen Loeb, a member of the faculty of Vassar College, lectures there on the Soviet economy, Marxian thought, Eastern European and Chinese affairs, and in an interdisciplinary course on Society Building: how to construct a society in which technology will serve man.

Born in Slovakia in 1907, Loeb entered private enterprise and was also a writer on economics and foreign trade. During World War II he joined the exile government in London, serving as head of its Ministry for Economic Reconstruction and as Economic Advisor to Foreign Minister Jan Masaryk. After the war, he became Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade under the Communist government, and in the face of Soviet disapproval tried to orient the Czechoslovak economy toward the West. As a result, he became a co-defendant in the notorious Stalinist trial of Rudolf Slansky, and was sentenced to life imprisonment. After 11 years in prison and concentration camp, he was released and eventually rehabilitated. He was serving as Director of the Slovak State Bank at the time of the 1968 "Prague Spring", and participated in the planning of its economic reforms. After the Soviet-led occupation he left Czechoslovakia, and lectured widely in German and American universities before assuming his present post.

Professor Loeb is the author of a book on the Slansky trials, published in the United States and nine other countries, as well as books on the problem of the young intelligentsia in a Communist society, and the shortcomings in practice of Marxist theory, and the problem of preserving human values in highly developed societies.

